First Part Follows.

B

Infant-Baptism FROM HEAVEN and not of MEN, THE SECOND PART: OR AN ANSWER TO Mr DANVERS his Treatise of BAPTISM.

Wherein, as the Vanity of his Authorities are, though briefly, yet sufficiently detected; so his Doctrinal Part is especially examined and confuted, and Infants Right to Baptism further confirmed.

By *J. Whiston*, Minister of the Gospel.

The lip of truth shall be established for ever, but the lying tongue is but for a moment, Prov. 12. 19.

In fœdere divino cum Abrahamo *inito substantia & veritas constans est & immutabilis*, Junius.

LONDON,
Printed for, and sold by *Jonathan Robinson*, at the *Golden Lion* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1676.

CHRISTIAN READER.

NEither the writing nor reading of Controverſies (ſuppoſing the ſubject weighty and important) would be without their pleaſure or profit, were they managed as they ought to be. The underſtanding of man finds ſomewhat of pleaſure even in ſearching after, much more in diſcovering truth, of what kind ſoever it be And that which adds not a little to the pleaſure and delight of a ſincere Chriſtian in ſearching after and finding out divine truth, is, as a conſciouſneſs to himſelf of diſcharging his duty in the ſearch he makes after it, ſo the great love he bears to it, and conſequently the acceptableneſs of it to him when found out. And for diſputable doctrines or practices to be throughly ventilated and ſifted, that the utmoſt of what may be ſaid either for or againſt them may be brought to light, is not a little profitable; it highly conducing to the conſcientious embracement or rejection of them, as alſo the peace and ſatisfaction of the mind, as having embraced or rejected according to the evidence appearing on the one or the other hand. But when men ſhall riſe up either in defence of, or oppoſition to any controverted doctrine or practice, and manage their undertaking only with naked repetitions of Scriptures, reaſons, or objections that have been already ſifted to the bran, and anſwered again and again, with the alone addition of ſome ungrounded dictates, illogical deductions, forgeries, or the like of their own, as it is matter of wonder, what content ſuch men can take in writing, ſo no pleaſure or emolument can ariſe unto Readers: But on the other hand as ſuch men muſt needs expoſe themſelves to contempt and ſcorn, ſo the iſſue of their writings will be the further exaſperations of mens ſpirits, and the diſquietment of their conſciences, who having been unwarily proſelyted, do at laſt come to diſcover the cheat that hath been put upon them. As for Infant-baptiſm, though to me it is

ἀναμφίδοξον, yet it muſt be reckoned among τὰ ἀμφίδοξα *Theologiæ*. Neither ſhall I be ſo uncharitable as to impute all the ſcrupſes that may ariſe in the minds of men about it, to ignorance or perverſeneſs, nor will I brand all enquirers about it as κυνδόμενοι τῇ ἀκοῇ · as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of ſome, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. Nor yet ſhould a rational logical diſcourſe, (ſuch as I deny not ſome of Mr. *Tombes* his former writings have been) in the examination of the chief grounds laid for it (provided the ſcripture be allowed the place *ſupremi judicis*) be at all offenſive, but greatly welcome unto me. But as for that tract of Mr. *Danvers* here examined, and ſome dictates of Mr. *Tombes* of later date, they are in the higheſt degree nauſeous, and can return to no good account either to Writers or Readers As for this Tract of Mr. *Danvers*, I can ſay no leſs of it, than that it is a meer cheat, neither can I well think himſelf can in his moſt ſerious thoughts paſs any other cenſure upon it. I have often thought (ſuppoſing him a man under any ſence of a future account) he muſt needs have that of the Apoſtle in his mind during the whole compoſure of it, *I have caught you with guile*. The utmoſt that he could rationally promiſe to himſelf, was, that he poſſibly might beguil ſome unwary Readers into a complyance with what himſelf had imbibed, under the notion of an important truth. How he could imagine that his attempts ſhould prove ſucceſsful with any men of a competent underſtanding I cannot ſee? Seeing his book carryes along with it a ſufficient antidote againſt its own embracement by ſuch Readers. Could he think that his Authority ſhould be regarded by any man that attends to what he reads, or hath ſo much uſe of his own reaſon, as to compare what he finds in one page, with what he finds in another, when ſome of his own Authors ſo evidently contradict what others of them, and thoſe *multis nominibus* leſs regardable do affirm; will any man of an ordinary underſtanding, who lies not under the force of his own prejudices and præingagements believe that *Boemius*, *Willfrid Strabo*, or any other contemporary with, or conſequent unto them, could better know what the prtmitive practice was, than

Auſtin

Auſtin or *Chryſoſtom*, who lived ſo many hundred years nearer thoſe times than they did? Will any man entertain the leaſt ſuppoſition that Pope *Innocent* was the inventor or the inſtitutor of Infant-baptiſm, when ſuch credible and unqueſtionable Authors as theſe ſhall in expreſs terms affirm it was in his days the univerſal practice of the whole Church, yea had been ſo time out of mind? As for the argumentative part of his book, alas! how little more, yea how much leſs hath he ſaid, than what others have ſaid before him? Who may not ſay, who knows not ſuch things as theſe? As for what he hath added of his own, it cannot well but be interpreted no leſs than an impeachment of the underſtandings of all men, ſo much as to offer any aſſiſtance to diſcover the weakneſs and fallaciouſneſs of it: And his book carrying ſuch apparent preſervatives againſt its own reception, no wonder though it meet with no ſooner a reply. Alas! who could imagine that it needed any? For my own part, it coſt me not a few thoughts to determine with my ſelf what ſhould be the Authors deſign in it. Sometimes I was ready to think he was no friend to the Anabaptiſts, but deſigned only to caſt a ſlur upon their cauſe: Sometimes I was ready to think he only deſigned to gain to himſelf the repute of a man of great reading, and that the argumentative part was only to make way to the publication of thoſe variety of collections he had heaped up. And other thoughts I had, but at laſt hearing more of him; (for he is wholly unknown to me by face) charity obligeth me to hope he is one of thoſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, who building upon *that good foundation the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, though it be *wood, hay, and ſtubble*, yet themſelves *ſhall be ſaved. yet ſo as by fire with the loſs of their works.* I hope he hath at leaſt an habitual love for our Lord Chriſt, and verily judgeth the promotion of the cauſe he is engaged in would be acceptable ſervice to him, ſince he hath managed his whole undertaking ſo, as he conceiv'd it might prove ſucceſsful among at leaſt perſons of weaker judgments.

I remember not long ſince one of the ſame perſwaſion with *our Author* having put forth a ſmall tract in purſu-

ance of the ſame deſign, I hapned to meet him at a friend-houſe in *Wapping*, whither he had brought ſome of his books to be diſperſed among the men of his own perſwaſion. I caſt my eye upon one of them, and preſently diſcerning the fallacy. I askt him whether he knew of no weightier objections that might be raiſed againſt his aſſertions than what he had there taken notice of? His reply was, he hoped that what he had done might do ſome good. So I ſuppoſe Mr. *Danvers*, though he could not hope that any perſons of learning or judgement would be moved by what he had written, yet he hoped that his pains might do ſome good according to his account of good. But alas! ſuch petty deſigns will in the cloſe only prove deſtructive to the cauſe, the ſupportation of which is attempted by them; when any opinions or practices appear evidently to be only ſupported by fraud and guile, or that which is worſe, however thoſe that are præingaged may be backward to relinquiſh them, yet all that are diſingaged muſt needs be greatly prejudiced, as againſt the opinions and practices themſelves, ſo againſt the promoters of them. It hath been (as I have elſewhere intimated) no little wonder to me, whence it ſhould come to paſs that Chriſtians, and thoſe too, at leaſt ſome of them men of learning and judgment, ſhould ſo tenaciouſly maintain an opinion lying in ſuch a direct oppoſition to their childrens good as well as their own comfort, and can ſatisfie themſelves with ſuch pityful nonſenſical evaſions and petty reaſonings, yea will rather run themſelves upon the greateſt abſurdities, than ſubmit to the plaineſt demonſtrations. And after much revolving the matter in my mind, I cannot but aſſign the cauſe hereof, as to the things there mentioned, ſo to their præingagements, and in ſpecial to the want of a clear underſtanding in the Covenant of Grace, both in reſpect of the good granted, and conveyed thereby to the Infant-ſeed of believers, and the true tenour thereof, as extended to and made with them: And pardon me though I ſay I cannot but think not only Antipædobaptiſts, but even Pædobaptiſts themſelves, yea and that ſome of the moſt learned among them, have been greatly wanting herein:

in: Hence are those expressions, in the writings of Pædobaptists, of an outward Covenant, a Covenant of priviledges and the like, phrases greatly obstructing the reception of the truth they have done worthily in the defence of. From the same cause in the general, it is that our opposers talk of a Covenant with the elect, and of that grand promise of Gods being a God to people, implying and necessarily including all that good whether relative or positive contained in all the promises of the Covenant. Were the primitive doctrine of the Covenant revived, I should not much question but all men of judgment and conscience would soon center in the primitive practice of Infant-baptism, some essays of that nature shall συὺν θεῷ shortly be made publick. This I would only say at present, that the Covenant taking it in a proper sence, as (implying a stipulation on Gods part, and a restipulation on mans) is so far from being restrained to the elect, that it is not made with any one of the Elect, *quâ* Elect. Election is unto eternal life, to the attaining of which they are predestinated to a Covenant-state, neither are any *Abrahams* seed meerly as elected. Hence were it evident that this or that particular person, whether Infant or Adult were elect, yet could he not be duly baptized on that account. It is Covenant-interest not Election that gave a right of Circumcision of old, and gives a right to Baptism still: Were but the Covenant rightly understood, this controversie about Infant-baptism would have vastly less difficulty in it. Its true tis a controversie of long agitation, which renders the gaining satisfaction about it more difficult, and cannot ordinarily be attained to without some considerable pains and diligence, as well as a freedom from all prepossessions and preingagements. But will any serious enquirers willing to take what pains and use what diligence is necessary in such a case (suspending for the present their judgment about the good and benefit that the seed of believers have by vertue of their Covenant-interest, and membership in the Church, and answerably waving the interpretations put upon the promises appertaining unto them, with the deductions drawn

therefrom) throughly weigh, and faithfully compare what is written on both ſides, in ſpecial by Mr. *Danvers* and Mr. *Tombes*, including his late letter to Mr. *Danvers*, on the one ſide, and by Mr. *Baxter* taking in the enſuing papers, and that ſmall treatiſe often referred to in them, on the other, as I doubt not but they will be ſufficiently furniſhed with light to proceed by; ſo I ſhall freely leave the controverſie to their determination and doubt not but that though they may not at preſent ſee what is the proper benefit Infants have by their Covenant-intereſt, Church-memberſhip and Baptiſm, nor apprehend how the one or the other can be granted to them without ſome inconveniences enſuing, yet will be clearly convinced that both the one and the other muſt be granted to them; and anſwerably when they come to ſee the true tenour of the Covenant ſtated, and thoſe inconveniences feared, obviated, they will be abundantly ſatisfied in the determination they have made. And therefore though I had ſometimes thought to have made ſome animadverſions upon that late letter of Mr. *Tombes* to Mr. *Danvers*; yet I ſhall wave it, not doubting but the Reader will find what is material in it ſufficiently obviated in the enſuing papers, taken in conjunction with the treatiſe referred to. It is true Mr. *Danvers* hath found out a new or rather reviv'd an old device, and that is, that however conſequences may be drawn, and inferences made in other caſes, yet in the worſhip of God nothing as worſhip is to be admitted without ſome plain and expreſs word, either by precept or example, to warrant the ſame: And this he ſaith (though according to his intendment moſt falſely and diſingeniouſly) is a known agreed rule among Proteſtants, and cites according to his uſual manner ſeveral Authors for it. To which I would ſay in the words of a late worthy Author, that it muſt be a deſperate cauſe that cannot otherwiſe be maintained, *viz.* than by denying ſcripture-conſequences. And let me only ask Mr. *Danvers* whether the obſervation of the Lords day be a part of divine worſhip, at leaſt be not acknowledged ſo to be by the generality of Proteſtants, and in ſpecial by thoſe Authors he cites, and whether there be

any

any ſuch expreſs precept or example as he requires to warrant the ſame, though there is enough in ſcripture to prove that it ought to be obſerved which ſufficiently ſhews his miſtake of theſe Authors. They undoubtedly take conſequences rightly and duly drawn equivalent to expreſs precept and example. And let me ſay, will he not allow ſound conſequences in matters of worſhip, he will leave but little worſhip to be performed by the Church, and himſelf muſt reject ſome parts of worſhip, which yet I hope he owns and walks in the practice of. But men that are reſolved to maintain their opinions, muſt ſay ſomewhat that may look like reaſon in the eyes of byaſſed or weak men, how unreaſonable and abſurd ſoever it be in the judgment of others. And yet further, let it be obſerved that whereas our oppoſers take it for granted and perſwade people that we have only conſequences to ground our judgment and practice upon, the truth is, we have eſpecially for what we mainly contend for, *viz.* the Covenant-intereſt, and Church-membership of the ſeed of believers, the plain and expreſs letter of the Scriptures, and they have only conſequences to oppoſe us withal. The words are as expreſs as words can be. *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed in their generations.* Now take this promiſe as firſtly made to *Abraham* himſelf, and according to the letter of it, it muſt needs intend his natural ſeed immediately proceeding from his own loins. And the Apoſtle in expreſs words tells us that the bleſſing of *Abraham* is come upon believing Gentiles. Or take the promiſe according to the full latitude of it as including his ſpiritual ſeed, yet to exclude his natural is contrary to the very letter of the promiſe, *i.* take it as made to his ſeed, ſo it is to them in their Generations, which according to the letter muſt include their ſeed with them. So the Apoſtle tells thoſe awakened Jews, the promiſe was to them and their Children. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians* in expreſs words their Children were holy, yet once again, the Apoſtle aſſures the Jaylor, that he believing, not only himſelf but his houſe ſhould be ſaved. Which promiſe I ſuppoſe our oppoſers themſelves will grant is applicable to all in his

his caſe, and anſwerably according to the very letter takes in their Infant-ſeed ſuppoſing them to have any ſuch. Here are no conſequences but the plain and expreſs words of Scripture, and our oppoſers have only conſequences by which they endeavour to prove that theſe ſcriptures are not to be underſtood according to the letter, but muſt have another ſence and meaning put upon them: Hence would our oppoſers yield to the very letter of the ſcriptures, and grant the promiſes of the Covenant do appertain to the ſeed of believers, and only ſuſpend their Baptiſm, our differences would be very much healed. And yet further, let me ſay we want very little of the expreſs letter of the ſcripture for their Baptiſm. It is according to the expreſs letter of the ſcripture, that *Abrahams* ſeed in their Generations (which I have ſaid muſt according to the letter include Parents and Children) ſhould keep the Covenant, that is the token of the Covenant, and what other token there now is that can poſſibly be underſtood in this command to be kept by *Abrahams* ſeed, that is by believers in their generations, excepting Baptiſm, cannot be ſhewed. So according to the letter of the Scripture, intereſt in the promiſe is a ſufficient ground for Baptiſm. *Repent and be baptized, for the promiſe is to you.* So that would but our oppoſers lay aſide conſequences and yield to the letter of the Scripture, our contentions would be, if not wholly at an end, yet greatly abated, we ſhall infallibly have what we mainly contend for, and a fair ground will be layd for our practice. And from what hath been ſaid, it evidently appears our oppoſers are equally concerned in conſequences with our ſelves, and anſwerably ſuch pleas muſt be look'd upon but as mere pretences to ſcreen off that light they are unwilling to ſubmit unto. And indeed as the whole deſign of our Author, ſo many paſſages in Mr. *Tombes* his latter writings ſufficiently evidence they are now reduced to meer artifices and ſhifts for the ſupportation of the cauſe they have unadviſedly engaged in. As an evidence hereof take an inſtance or two. Whereas *our Author* had ſaid, the *Magdeburgenſes* tell us, that in the firſt Century, they find they [only] baptized the Adult,

and

and being charged by Mr. *Wills* with the falſification of thoſe Authors, and accuſed by ſome miniſters of immorality, as well he might, let us ſee how in his reply to Mr. *Wills* he comes off. And to let paſs his firſt anſwer, which only concerns Mr. *Wills*, his ſecond is this, *viz.* that theſe words in his book are not his tranſlation of their words, but his own ſence upon them. But

Firſt, I would appeal to Mr. *Danvers* his own conſcience, whether he would not have had his Reader, and to all Readers, whether they did not underſtand them as their very words? His words are expreſs, they tell us. Now who could imagine that Mr *Danvers* his meaning was only this, that ſo much might be inferred from their words. But granting him this, I would then appeal to him whether he did not deſign to put a cheat upon his Readers? For I would ask him as he will anſwer it at the bar of Jeſus Chriſt, whether he was not willing that his Reader ſhould, and did expect that he would believe that theſe *Magdeburgenſes* had affirmed, at leaſt granted ſomewhat more in favour of his cauſe, than what is the univerſal grant of all Pedobaptiſts? otherwiſe what a frivolous thing was it for him to bring them in as witneſſes for him, But

Secondly, No ſuch ſence or interpretation can with any ſhew of Reaſon be put upon them, for they are very confident none more, that not only the Adult, but alſo Infants were baptized in that age, grounding that their confidence partly upon the Scriptures themſelves, and partly upon the teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers that lived near thoſe times, Now when they make only ſuch a grant as is made by all Pedobaptiſts, *viz.* that no expreſs Example Is left upon record of any Infants being baptized, yet expreſſing the higheſt confidence that they were baptized, withal declaring the ground they had both from ſcripture and humane Authority for that their confidence, can any rational man interpret them as ſaying they find they baptized only the Adult, when they aſſure us they find the quite contrary, that they baptized Infants as well as the Adult.

Again, Whereas he had ſo diſingeniouſly ſaid that Tradition

Tradition was the principal ground laid for Infant baptiſm, and Mr. *Wills* had charged him with immodeſty, ſee how he comes off in his reply? Why it is by proceeding from immodeſty to impudence. For

Firſt, He would perſwade his Reader, that there is little or no difference between the ſence in which Proteſtants and Papiſts uſe the term Tradition, which is notoriouſly falſe. taking it of Tradition in the general; though it is true, the Papiſts ſpeaking of Infant-baptiſm ſometimes contradict themſelves, affirming that it may be plainly enough gathered out of the Scriptures, which is inconſiſtent with their notion of Tradition.

Secondly, He would perſwade his Reader, that take away Tradition, the doctrine and practice of Infant-baptiſm (according to our own conceſſions) would fall to the ground, when he cannot but know that moſt, if not univerſally all the chief aſſertors of Infant-baptiſm affirm, it may be proved alone from the Scriptures, though the doctrine and practice of the Church were utterly unknown. And if ſuch men are not put to their ſhifts, I know not who are. The like may be ſeen in Mr. *Tombes*. Hence is that abſurd notion invented of the ſeed of the Jews being Church-members meerly by a fact of divine providence. Hence he ſeems to deſign the ſcaring his Reader into a compliance with his notions: Hence are thoſe big words ſpeaking of Mr. *Baxters* book of Baptiſm, ſaith he, that accurſed book, and why is it accurſed? but becauſe Mr. *Tombes* nor any others of his party can anſwer it. So ſpeaking of the epiſtle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, tis ſaith he an abſurd Epiſtle, wheu he knows, be it as abſurd as it will (though ſo abſurd as he pretends it is not) ſo long as it is genuine, and not forged (which he cannot ſay it is) it ſufficiently ſerves our purpoſe, fully declaring that the primitive practice was for Infant-baptiſm.

Yet once again, with him to affirm that *Iſhmael* was in Covenant, is in expreſs words to gainſay the Apoſtle. And why ſo? Becauſe the Apoſtle tells us he was caſt out (*Gal.* 4.) that is out of the Covenant as hath been proved. Now to ſay he was ever in Covenant, becauſe the Apoſtle

ſaith

ſaith he was after caſt out of it, is with Mr. *Tombes* to gainſay the Apoſtle; and variety of like inſtances might be given. Now ſurely ſuch things ſhew, men are reduced to their ſhifts, they ſee their cauſe would utterly fall, ſhould it not be ſupported by ſuch artifices and ſhifts. But I muſt haſten.

Reader. Thou mayſt eaſily perceive, I have not been very forward to engage in this controverſie. Thou wilt ſtill find me in the rear: I am aware what diſcouragements attend ſuch undertakings, ſaith *Auſtin*, *Bella quantumvis juſta attamen hominibus moleſta et triſtia videntur, nam inter alia quæ refugit humanum ingenium, videbunt adverſariæ partis iniquitatem propter quam coguntur pugnare, nec de eâ non poterunt non dolere*, which is too evidently verified in our preſent conteſts. Hence a man can hardly appear againſt any error, but he will ſeem to be an enemy as well to the perſons holding, as to the errors held by them. It muſt be ſaid, ſo ill hath our preſent Author managed his undertaking- that it is hard, if poſſible, to detect his miſtakes. but his miſcarriages will be alſo detected. And how his Antagoniſt ſhall be treated by him may be too plainly gueſſed at, by the ill manner of his managing his cauſe. *Solomon* indeed tells us, *that he that paſſeth by, and medleth with ſtrife, that belongeth not to him, taketh a dog by the ears*. But be the Iſſue what it will, this will be my comfort, I have not medled with a ſtrife, that belongs not to me. I am ſet for the defence of the Goſpel, I had more than a ſingle call to this work. I ſee not how I could have held my peace, without making a breach upon my peace. And if any ſhall ſay I need not have interpoſed, others have ſaid enough, I anſwer, we account not the bringing water to quench fire got into the thatch ſuperfluous, ſo long as there is water enough to be brought and the fire is not throughly quenched.

Others have done well, yet ſomething more may be added. I muſt profeſs, I am ſo far from judging that all is ſaid, that can be ſaid for the clearing up and eſtabliſhing the practice contended for, that though I will not ſay little is ſaid in compariſon of what may be; yet I am very confident,

confident, much may be ſaid beyond what is. As for the enſuing papers, they principally concern the doctrinal part of Mr. *Danvers* his book, and hence I have kept to his firſt edition, underſtanding that no material alteration is made in his ſecond. What I have done is ſubmitted to the judgment of all unbyaſſed and intelligent Readers. Others have ſaid enough to diſcover the forgery and vanity of his Authorities, yet they are not wholly paſſed by. I know all could not buy all books that are written, and this may fall into the hands of ſome, into whoſe hands thoſe others may not come. And beſides, poſſibly ſome will be at a loſs not knowing whom to credit being themſelves unable to ſearch Authors, here they may ſee Mr. *Danvers* his witneſſes contradicting and confuting one another, and will but men ſeriouſly weigh his book, and compare his Authorities one with another, I doubt not they will find themſelves ſufficiently armed againſt all pretences, that either himſelf or any others may make of having humane authority on their ſide. For

Firſt, They will evidently ſee his forgeries, and that deſignedly to deceive his unwary Reader, hence as they are ſufficiently warned to take heed how to credit any thing himſelf hath ſaid or may ſay, ſo they have ground to be wary how they credit any of his perſwaſion in what ever pretences they may make of this nature.

Secondly, They will ſee that upon the utmoſt enquiry that can be made into antiquity (for ſuch an enquiry it may be ſuppoſed Mr. *Danvers* hath made) but only one, *viz.* poor *Tertullian* and he greatly abuſed too, can be pretended to have been againſt Infant-baptiſm for three hundred years after Chriſt. Mr. *Danvers* pretends to no more.

Thirdly, They will have the teſtimony of two of the moſt credible Authors that ever wrote, *viz.* *Chryſoſtom* and *Auſtin*, that before the year four hundred (for *Chryſoſtom* died in the year four hundred and five, and *Auſtin* in the year Four Hundred and Thirty) Infant baptiſm was the univerſal practice of the Church, yea had been ſo for ought what then appeared in any record from the Apoſtles

poſtles days. And they that will after this be deceived by any pretence of humane Authority they muſt thank themſelves, they have Mr. *Danvers* his book to riſe up in judgment againſt them.

Thine in the ſervice of the Goſpel.

J. W.

ERRATA.

READER, by reaſon of the Authors abſence from the preſs, many Erratas are eſcaped, the moſt material (ſome of which pervert the ſence) are here noted, the leſſer are left to thy ingenuity to correct or pardon.

Page 2. line 5: read *hence*. p. 7. l. 29. r. *cite*. p. 12. l. 3. r. *thirdly*. p. 32. l. 32. r. *during*. p. 48. l. 10. r. *leſs heed*. p. 49. l. 13. r. *razæ*. p. 50. l. 29. r. *oppoſed*. p. 51. l. 2. after *that they are* add *not*. p. 64. l. 18. r. 66. p. 65. in the marg. r. *ſcripturæ*. p. 68. l. 9. r. *by*. p. 71. in the contents r. *particulars*. p. 77. l. 15. r. *extend*. p. 94. l. 6. after *ſo* add *that*. p. 97. l. 17. r. *were*. p. 111. l. 13. r. *bad*. p. 119. l. 13. r. *lower*. l. 21. r. *under*.

Chap. I.

Wherein ſome general Conſiderations, relating to the authorities produced by Mr. Danvers, *in favour of Antipedobaptiſm, are laid down; ſhewing the vanity and inſignificancy of them, as to his purpoſe.*

IT is the Apoſtle *Judes* exhortation, that we ſhould *earneſtly contend for the faith, once delivered to the Saints*; and there are two things in ſpecial, that all Saints, yet more eſpecially thoſe, upon whom this duty is peculiarly incumbent, ought to contend for, with reference to the Faith. Firſt, its purity; Secondly, its integrity; that nothing be added thereto, nothing detracted there-from. And the Integrity of the Faith is of equal importance, and ought to be alike contended for, with the Purity thereof: Neither is the conditions or qualifications of any that attempt, either to corrupt it, by immixing their own Notions or Inventi-

ons therewith, or to make any breach therein; a ſufficient diſcharge from this duty: In the diſcharge whereof, yet regard is to be had, both to the perſons with whom, and matters about which we do contend. Here ſometimes we muſt contend earneſtly with thoſe that profeſs themſelves to be, and it may be hoped, intentionally are, Contenders for the Faith; yea, and ſharply to rebuke them for, not only the oppoſition they make, but their unchriſtian managing that oppoſition againſt, while they pretend, and poſſibly really intend to contend for, the Faith.

As for the Doctrine of Infant Baptiſm; the further vindication and eſtabliſhment of which, is at preſent deſigned: That it is, as I have formerly ſaid, and ſo am more and more confirmed, a part of that Faith once delivered to the Saints, and conſequently the contending for it, comes within the Compaſs of that Exhortation.

It is true, a late Author, for whom I have ſo much charity, as to hope he has (though greatly failing in a due uſe and exerciſe of his Grace, yet) an habitual good will for Chriſt, and the Faith delivered by him; has appeared not a little confident of the contrary; and anſwerably, has conceived himſelf obliged to make the utmoſt oppoſition he could, againſt that Doctrine and Practice, and induſtriouſly to endeavour the eſtabliſhment of Believers Baptiſm, in oppoſition thereunto. Which of our Confidences hath the ſurer ground, ſhall be left to the Judgment of all unprejudic'd perſons: But to lay what he hath ſaid in the Ballance. Two things he attempts to prove,

and

and ſeems to conceit that he has done both ſo effectually, as that he ſeems to ſtand amazed, that all men do not immediately fall down before the Evidence produced by him.

Firſt, he attempts to prove, That the Baptiſm of Believers is only Chriſt's Ordinance of Baptiſm.

Secondly, That the Baptiſm of Infants is no Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt.

Both theſe he attempts to prove by Scripture, by Reaſon, and Humane Authority: and though he would ſeem to make no great account of humane Authority, yet it ſeems impoſſible to me, that any man of a competent underſtanding ſhould ariſe to ſuch a height of confidence, as to the truth of his Aſſertions, as he is arrived to, had he not other grounds for it, than what he hath produced, either from Scripture or Reaſon. Alas! what a poor Pamphlet would his Treatiſe be, were all his humane Authorities pared off, and it left to defend its Cauſe, meerly by that evidence of Scripture and Reaſon it is furniſhed with; how evidently would the Scriptures, at leaſt the moſt of them appear to be but meer repetitions of ſuch Scriptures as have been anſwered again and again; without any ſhew of ſatisfaction given to thoſe anſwers, or the leaſt additional enforcement received from his application or improvement of them to his purpoſe.

What Reaſon does he offer, unleſs he will call his own ungrounded Dictates, or ſome frivolous deductions of ſuppoſed ill Conſequences of the Practice he oppoſes by that name. I

cannot therefore but think that however he puts it off in words, yet indeed the principal ground, he lays to his great confidence, of having ſo effectually performed his undertaking, is the humane Authorities he has produced in favour of his Cauſe; they muſt not therefore be wholly paſſed by: Yet ſeeing himſelf ſeems to make no more account of them, they being as he expreſſes it, but *Argumentum ad hominem*; (the reaſon of his ſo expreſſing himſelf cannot but be gueſſed at, I ſuppoſe he deſigned them *ad faciendum populum.*) I ſhall only here offer ſome few Conſiderations with reference to them in general, and leave them, to every one to make what uſe and improvement of them they ſee meet, and take the leſs notice of them in particular, as they occurr in the proceſs of his Diſcourſe.

Firſt, that which offers it ſelf to Conſideration is our Authors great Unfaithfulneſs in his Quotations, and groſs abuſe of the Authors cited by him in favour of his Cauſe: Sometimes he ſeems to have meerly forged Teſtimonies, and to pretend Authors to have ſaid, what he could wiſh they had; but what indeed never came into their minds, much leſs dropped from their pens: Sometimes he groſly perverts their words, wreſting them to ſuch a ſence as apparently was never intended by them: Sometimes he miſtakes, and fathers that upon one, which was ſpoken by another; *Teſtibus non teſtimoniis credendum eſt*, *&c.* but here no man can credit this Witneſs. And though variety of other inſtances

ſtances might be, and are by another hand given, of the like nature and import, yet I ſhall only inſtance in thoſe Teſtimonies he cites out of the *Magdeburgenſian Hiſtory* (of which he gives, and that not undeſervedly, a great *Encomium*) in the 1. 2. and 3. Centuries: *They tell us*, ſays he, in his 56. page, *that as to the buſineſs of Baptiſm in the 1. Century, they find to have been after this manner*; and he inſtances in ſix things, that they, as he ſaith, relate with reference to Baptiſm; four of which, if not five, concern his purpoſe no otherwiſe, than the furtherance of his Cauſe depends upon the bulk of his Book: that which only properly concerns his purpoſe is the firſt, which he ſets down thus.

As to the Subjects of Baptiſm they tell us that in this Age (meaning the firſt Century, the Age wherein Chriſt and his Apoſtles lived) *they find that they baptized only the adult or aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, whereof they ſay we have inſtances in the* 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. *Chapters of the* Acts: *But as to the baptizing of Infants they confeſs they read of no Example*; And he has the confidence to direct his Reader to the Century, Book and Page, where he ſaith they tell us all this: Whereas they are ſo far from telling us all this, that they ſay the direct contrary. Their words are expreſs, *Baptizatos eſſe adultos tam Judæos quam Gentes exempla probant*, Act. 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. *De infantibus baptizatis exempla quidem annotata non leguntur*; *ſed* Origenes, *&* Cyprianus, *& alii Patres authores ſunt Apoſtolorum etiam tempore baptizatos eſſe*; *conſtat etiam*

hoc ex Apostolorum scriptis, &c. i. e. *That the Aged whether Jews or Gentiles were baptized, those examples,* Act. 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. *prove. It is true indeed we read not of any expres examples of Infants being baptized: But that they were baptized even in the Apostles times, both* Origen, Cyprian, *and others of the Fathers do testifie; and this is also evident from the writings of the Apostles themselves:* and then they shew us what evidence they conceived they had from the Writings of the Apostles that Infants were baptized. Now is this to tell us, that they find they baptiz'd only the Adult? Nay, do they not tell us expresly, that they find *from the Writings of the Apostles, and the Testimonies of the Fathers* that lived near those times, that they baptized Infants, as well as grown persons. As for what our Author further saith they tell us, concerning the Ceremonies attending the Administration of Baptism, as that the parties baptized did freely come, and offer themselves, professing their Faith; what ever they tell us of that nature, they evidently mean it of the Adult, for so, lest they should be mistaken and misrepresented, they do in plain words expres themselves. *Ante Baptismatis impertitionem quoad adultos attinet de Doctrina Evangelii, &c. adultos edocuerunt*; they repeat that term *adult* twice, seeming to fear that their words might be wrested in favour of Antipedobaptism. Now then how far are these worthy Historians from saying *they find they baptized only the adult*; they tell us, that it is evident from the Apostles Writings, and also produce the Fathers living near those times, assuring us that Infants were then

then baptized, though no expreſs Example of their Baptizing is left upon Record. And having thus groſly abuſed theſe worthy Centuriators in this firſt Century, he proceeds both to abuſe them, and impoſe upon his incautelous Reader in what he cites out of them in the 2. 3. and 4. Centuries; for thus he adds page 59. As to Baptiſm in the 2. Century, *They ſay* (meaning theſe Magdiburgenſes) Century 2. Chap. 6. pag. 109. *that it doth not appear by any approved Authors that there was any mutation or variation from the former*, and in confirmation hereof quotes what *Juſtin Martyr* ſaith in his ſecond Apology to *Anton. Pius* the Emperour. Now he would have the Reader believe they ſay this with reference to the Subjects of Baptiſm, and conſequently that they hereby deny Infant baptiſm to be as yet brought into the Church; whereas they ſpeak not at all in that place cited by him of the Subjects of Baptiſm, but only of the Rites and Ceremonies attending its Adminiſtration; for ſo they intitle their Diſcourſe, *De Ritibus circa Baptiſmum*: And the inſtance they give of the Jew baptized in the wilderneſs by his fellow-travellers (a Story I ſuppoſe our Author was willing to overlook) plainly ſhews it. But when they ſpeak of the Subjects of Baptiſm, *Chap. 4. p. 48.* they ſay expreſly, *Nec uſquam legitur Infantes hoc ſæculo à Baptiſmo remotos eſſe*, and cites *Origen*, as affirming that the Baptiſm of Infants had been received by the Church as a Tradition from the Apoſtles. And after the ſame manner does he moſt groſly abuſe them, and impoſe upon his Reader in what he cites out of them in the

3. and 4. Century. But it is needleſs to trace him any farther; by what hath been ſaid we may ſee the great unfaithfulneſs of our Author: So that look what Cenſure *Eraſmus* put upon *Origen*'s Works, tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, the ſame muſt be paſt upon his Treatiſe; no man knows when he reads Mr. *Dawers*, and when he reads the Authors cited by him. And this conſideration alone renders all his Quotations uſeleſs; in as much as no man can truſt him any farther than themſelves examine the Authors produced by him; and ſuppoſe they may find him faithful in any one, yet that is no aſſurance that he is ſo in any other. He that knowingly falſifies one Author, deſerves no credit in what he cites from any other. But to proceed.

Secondly, That which lies obvious to our obſervation is the utter Uſeleſneſs, Inſignificancy, and Impertinency of very many, if not the major part of the Teſtimonies produced by him as to his purpoſe, ſuppoſe he hath been faithful in them: This will abundantly appear in a four-fold Inſtance.

Firſt, not a few ſpeak nothing at all to his purpoſe; it can hardly be imagined what came into his head to ſwell up his Book with them: Thus to give the Reader a few Inſtances, that he may make more thorough obſervation himſelf, and he will be ſooner furniſhed with plenty of Inſtances of the ſame nature. Thus in the 282. Page, where he attempts to prove the *Waldenſes* were againſt Infants Baptiſm, he cites two of their ancient Confeſſions, wherein *they profeſs themſelves to own only Two Sacraments, viz.* Baptiſm,

Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper; and what can our Author infer from hence in favour of his Aſſertion? Did ever any make Infants Baptiſm a third Sacrament? So for what he cites out of *Vignier* his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Page 283. makes as little for his purpoſe, he tells us they expreſly declare to receive the Canon of the Old and New Teſtament, and to reject all Doctrines that have not their foundation in, or are in any thing contrary to it; therefore condemn all the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*. And who among Proteſtants may not be proved to reject Infants Baptiſm, if ſuch Profeſſions may go for proof? For our Author himſelf to fancy that Infant-baptiſm is a humane Tradition or Ceremony, and conceit, without any rational ground, that others have done ſo too; and hereupon to apply all that they have ſaid or written, either for the perfection or ſufficiency of the Scriptures, or againſt humane Traditions or Ceremonies, as an evidence of their being againſt Infant-baptiſm, ſuperlatively abſurd and ridiculous. Of the ſame nature is that he tells us out of *Socrates* and *Criſpin*'s Hiſtories, Page 272. concerning Pope *Innocent*, baniſhing the Donatiſts out of *Rome*, and the agreement between them and the Novatians, in the things there mentioned: what does all that make to prove that they were againſt the baptizing of Infants? Muſt every one that any Pope hath baniſhed out of *Rome* be preſently an Anabaptiſt; or muſt all thoſe that agree in the things there expreſſed be againſt baptizing of Infants? By ſuch kind of proofs

proofs who may not be made Anabaptists? But to leave the Reader to make his own observation and to proceed.

Secondly, nothing can be rationally concluded from others of his Authorities in favour of what he designs the proof of by them: Thus in his 282. 283. 284. Pages he cites two more ancient Waldensian Confessions of Faith, with their Treatise of Antichrist; wherein they profess their belief: That in the Sacrament of Baptism, Water is the visible and external Sign which represents unto Believers, that, which by the invisible vertue of God's operating is within them: as also they profess that by Baptism they are received into the holy Congregation of the people of God, there openly protesting and declaring their Faith and amendment of Life: So that God is worshipped in vain, when persons are enjoyned to partake of Sacraments without Faith and Truth. So they condemned Antichrist for attributing Regeneration to the outward work of baptizing Children (for that is all they condemn him for;) though our Author misrepresents their words, and makes them little less than nonsence, that they may seem more fully to favour his Cause. But now who can rationally conclude from all this, that they were against Infant-baptism; seing the very same, or like Professions have been made, and the like Expressions used by the generality of the Protestants in their Confessions and other Writings, who yet have zealously asserted Infant-baptism. To instance only in the *Helvetian Confession*, whose words are these, *We by being baptized*

tized do confeſs our Faith; and yet in the very next page ſay, *We condemn the Anabaptiſts, who deny, that any Infants born of faithful Parents are to be baptized.* How far ſuch Expreſſions are conſiſtent with the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-baptiſm may be conſidered by and by: But to interpret ſuch Expreſſions, or Profeſſions, as an Evidence of the Authors denial of Infant-bapriſm is irrational; ſeing they are the Expreſſions and Profeſſions, commonly made by thoſe who profeſſedly own the Doctrine, and live in the Practice of Infant-baptiſm. Again, for what our Author tells us, that Doctor *Uſher* cites out of *Thuanus*, *That ſeveral of the Berengarians, did upon examination ſay, That Baptiſm did not profit Children to ſalvation*, page 288. who can rationally infer from thence, that they denied Infant-baptiſm? They might deny that Baptiſm profited Children to Salvation, eſpecially that it did profit them meerly *opere operato*, which was the thing they denied, and yet not deny their Baptiſm: But to haſten. By what hath been ſaid, it evidently appears that our Author cannot produce any one Article in all their Confeſſions, nor one Paſſage out of any of their own Writings, that make it ſo much as probable, that the *Waldenſes* were againſt Infant-baptiſm. He hath only groundleſs Suppoſitions, falſe Reports, malicious Accuſations of their Enemies, to ground his perſwaſions of their rejecting Infant-baptiſm upon; when it is evident on the other hand from their own Confeſſions, and other Writings, that they did, at leaſt as to the Generality of them, own and live in that Practice.

ctice. Variety of other inſtances might be given, but let theſe ſuffice. Therefore

Secondly, other of his Authorities, though they ſeem, according to the Letter of the words cited by him, ſomewhat to countenance his Aſſertions, yet nothing leſs was intended by the Authors themſelves; neither can their words, all things conſidered, be rationally interpreted at all in favour of them: Of this kind are, if not univerſally all, yet the moſt of thoſe Teſtimonies he cites out of the Writings of Pedobaptiſts. What they ſpeak of, or with reference to the Adult, he will needs preſs into the ſervice of his Cauſe, and apply them for the excluſion of Infants from Baptiſm, and eſtabliſhment of Believers Baptiſm in oppoſition thereunto.

Thus all thoſe Quotations out of *Calvin*, *Piſcator*, *Perkins* and *Paræus*, to prove, that the Commiſſion given by Chriſt to his Diſciples muſt be underſtood, as reſtraining Baptiſm only to Believers; ſo almoſt throughout his whole Book. It is in vain to enumerate Inſtances.

It's true, he grants their Judgment and Practice was for Infant-baptiſm; but ſays he in his Preface, to take his own words, *By how much they were againſt the Truth* (ſo he calls his Opinion) *in their Practice, by ſo much the Power and Providence of God may appear, ſo to make their Tongues and Pens to fall upon themſelves.*

And he takes Mr. *Baxter* as a ſpecial Inſtance of the Power and Providence of God in this matter, To which let me ſay, Before he had intereſted the Power and Providence of God in matters

matters of this nature, he ſhould have offered ſomething at leaſt to prove the inconſiſtency of what they have written, with the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-baptiſm; leſt he be found to take the Name of God in vain, as well as abuſe his Authors and Readers, which he hath not at all attempted to do: Wherein is the Contradiction between what they ſay of, or with reſpect to the Adult, and what they ſay and practiſe with reference to Infants? Sure unto Contradictions ſo much is at leaſt abſolutely neceſſary, That *affirmatio & negatio ſit de eodem aut reſpectu ejuſdem.* Our Lord Chriſt ſays to the Jews, *Except ye believe that I am he, ye ſhall die in your ſins*; yet ſpeaking of Infants, ſaith, *Of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven*: Now who ever had ſo little underſtanding as to argue againſt Chriſt's intending Infants from a ſuppoſition, that then he muſt needs contradict himſelf in what he ſays to the Jews.

Again, ſays *Paul*, *He that will not work, let him not eat*, yet exhorts *aged women to teach young women*, as other duties, ſo this *to love their Children*, which ſurely includes the giving them neceſſary food: Now will any be ſo prophane and irrational as to ſay, here appears the Power and Providence of God in making *Paul's* Tongue and Pen to fall upon himſelf.

Thus *Calvin* and other Pedobaptiſts ſay, that men may rightly offer themſelves to Baptiſm; Confeſſion of ſins is required, otherwiſe the whole action would be nothing elſe but ſport, yet adding an expreſs, *Notandum eſt de adultis hic verba fieri*: and then elſewhere ſays,

That

That the Covenant, and Promiſes are extended to the Infants of Believers, and on that ground they are to be baptized.

And now Mr. *Danvers* preſently conceits here's a wonderful Power and Providence of God in ſo making their Tongues and Pens to fall upon themſelves; yet attempts not to ſhew wherein the inconſiſtency between what they ſay with reference to the Adult, and what they ſay with reference to Infants does appear.

But it may be it will be ſaid, however others may be reconciled to themſelves, yet Mr. *Baxter* cannot; for he ſpeaks more ſignificantly, he ſays of the Commiſſion: It purpoſely expreſſeth the Diſciples ſeveral works, in their ſeveral Places and Orders. Their firſt task is to make Diſciples, which are by *Mark* called Believers; their ſecond work is to baptize them, whereunto is annexed the Promiſe of Salvation; the third work is to teach them all other things. So again he argues moſt ſignificantly: If there can be no Example given in Scripture, of any one that was baptized without profeſſion of a ſaving Faith, nor any Precept for ſo doing, then we muſt not baptize any without it: But the Antecedent is true, therefore the Conſequent: And he often uſeth excluſive terms; ſaith that Jeſus Chriſt hath by Scripture-precept and Example, directed us to baptize thoſe that profeſs true Repentance, and no other, and therefore we muſt baptize them and no other.

Now ſays Mr. *Danvers* in his Preface, Theſe Aſſertions, in the apprehenſion of ſuch ignorant Creatures as we are, ſeem to be as contrary to his

his former Writings (he means thoſe wherein he pleads for Infant-baptiſm) as light is to darkneſs. But let me only ſay, that though it is poſſible, there are ſuch ignorant Creatures in the world as he talks of, yet I much ſuſpect he himſelf is not ſo ignorant as he pretends; for I doubt not but he knows full well, that Mr. *Baxter* plainly enough declares, that they are only the Adult he ſpeaks with reference to, in all that he ſaith of this nature: and wherein any difficulty ſhould ly in reconciling all that he ſaith with reference to them, with what he ſays, with reference to Infants, our Author ſhews us not, neither can he: for who can imagine that a man ſhould contradict himſelf, when he expreſly declares he ſpeaks of, or with reference to different Subjects. Where is the Contradiction between ſaying, that the Commiſſion of Chriſt for preaching and baptizing, as it reſpects, and is to be executed with reference to the Adult, it muſt be executed in this order.

Firſt, perſons muſt be taught or made Diſciples, and then baptized: But as for Infants, the caſe is different, they have a right to the Covenant and Promiſes, as deſcending from believing Parents, and onthat account are to be baptized. Now I ſay who can rationally ſuppoſe this man, as thus expreſſing himſelf; ſhould contradict himſelf; men muſt be very ignorant indeed, that need help to reconcile ſuch things as theſe, and from hence we may ſee, how utterly uſeleſs and inſignificant all that our Author hath cited out of the writings of the Pedobaptiſt is, as to his cauſe.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Not a few of his Authorities, either ſpeak expreſly againſt him. or if they may ſeem to ſpeak any thing for, yet as much or more againſt him, whence his Cauſe ſtands condemned out of the mouth of his own Witneſſes: Thus attempting to prove that in the third Century, believers baptiſm was only practiſed. Having greatly abuſed (though as the Reader may eaſily ſee, little to his own advantage) the worthy Magdeburgenſes, who expreſly ſay in the very page cited by himſelf, and conſequently (unleſs he received his Collections from another hand) could not but know it, *Baptizabantur autem in utroque ſexu adulti ſimul & infantes* (Cent. 3. Chap. 6. pag. 124.) he brings in Mr. *Baxter* as ſaying in his Principles of Love, pag. 7. *that he knew in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen, and Auſtin, men had liberty to be baptized, or to bring their Children when, and at what age they pleaſed.*

Now take his words as cited by our Author, yet they make more againſt him than for him; for if men might bring their Children, to Baptiſm when, and at what age they pleaſed, then they might bring them in their infancy, yea, *Mox poſtquam editi* as *Cyprian*'s phraſe is, though there was no humane Law to inforce them ſo to do. So again, whereas he had brought in ſeveral councels, and particular Authors to bear witneſs as he ſpeaks to believers baptiſm, in oppoſition to that of Infants in the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Century, page 76, 78. yet after (*viz.*) in the 2. Chapter of his Second Part, he brings in ſome of theſe very Councils, and Authors, as ordaining and bearing witneſs to Infant baptiſm,

yea

yea, and affirming that it was in thoſe very ages the practice of the Univerſal Church, and had been ſo time out of mind.

For brevity ſake, let us only take a more exact account of thoſe two renowned Authors, *viz. Chryſoſtom*, and *Auſtin*, both theſe he cites as witneſſes for believers Baptiſm, *Pag.* 76. yet ſee what he cites out of both theſe for Infant-Baptiſm, *Chryſoſtom*'s words as cited by himſelf, *Pag.* 121. are theſe, *Infants ought to be Baptized as univerſally received by the Catholick Church, to take away Original Sin*, ſo that Infant-Baptiſm was in *Chryſoſtom*'s days, *the univerſal practice of the Church. Auſtin*'s words as cited by himſelf *Pag.* 152. are theſe, *if there be any that do enquire for a Divine Authority for the Baptizing of Children, let them know, that what the univerſal Church holds, nor was inſtituted by Councils, but always retained, is moſt rightfully believed to have been delivered by no other than an Apoſtolical Authority* ſo that here is a Witneſs of our Authors own bringing forth, who affirms *verbis rotundis*.

Firſt, that the univerſal Church did then hold Infant-Baptiſm.

Secondly, That it was not inſtituted by any Council, I may add, much leſs then by any particular man.

Thirdly, That it had been always retained, that is, ever ſince the days of the Apoſtles.

Fourthly, That hereupon it is moſt rightfully believed to have been delivered by no other than Apoſtolical Authority.

And what other Teſtimonies to the univerſal practice of Infant-Baptiſm in thoſe Ages, do we

need, or can we deſire, than what our Authors own witneſſes give.

And here let it be obſerved, that theſe two Authors lived in that very Age, when he ſaith Infant Baptiſm, was inſtituted, and impoſed by Pope *Innocent*; but whether it be in the leaſt degree probable that it was indeed ſo, let all men Judge: but of that more hereafter.

If any ſhall ſay, if theſe Councils, and Fathers were for Believers Baptiſm, and yet practiſed Infant Baptiſm, how ſhall they be reconciled, how ſhall we reconcile their Doctrine to their Practice? Now for that our Author himſelf hath brought forth two Decrees, the former of *Juſtinian*, the other of *Juſtinus* the Emperours, that will fully reconcile this ſeeming Contradiction: *Juſtinian*'s Decree was this, as recited by our Author *Pag.* 127. *that Children ſhould be admitted to Baptiſm, but that thoſe that were come to their full growth, ſhall be taught before they be Baptized.* See again the decree of *Juſtinus* to the ſame purpoſe, in the ſame Page; whence it appears, that theſe Councils, and Fathers, were for the Baptizing of Believers afore unbaptized, (as we ſtill are) and alſo for the Baptiſm of their infants. So that as our Author hath ſhewed us, how to underſtand the Fathers, and conſequently all other Pedo-Baptiſts, when they ſpeak of Baptizing grown Perſons, or of Prerequiſites to their Baptiſm, ſo he hath rendred the ſumm of all his quotations, either out of the Fathers, or modern Pedo-Baptiſts, utterly inſignificant and uſeleſs, as to his purpoſe: And how his pen comes thus to fall upon himſelf, and his own Cauſe, I ſhall

deſire

desire him to enquire, and leave all other men to judge.

Other instances of this nature might be taken notice of, as when he cites Dr. *Owen* to prove that that Promise *Gen.* 17. *vers.* 7. belongs only to the spiritual seed of *Abraham Pag.* 210. the Doctor saith *the effectual dispensation of the Covenant is peculiar to them only.* Plainly, implying that some grace is dispenced to others, though the effectual dispensation be peculiar to them, but let that suffice for the Second Consideration relating to his Authorities.

Thirdly, That which yet further is to be Considered, is the incredibility, and unregardableness of those Testimonies produced by him, that do more plainly, and expresly favour his assertions, and they are incredible and unregardable, either in regard of the Authors, or the Testimonies themselves.

First, Some are not at all to be Credited in regard of the Authors whose Testimonies they are: Thus for all those testimonies (excepting those taken out of their own writings, the usefulness of which we have already seen) cited to prove the *Waldenses* to be opposers of Infant Baptism. They are either the Testimonies of the Papists, their inveterate Enemies, or of Protestants only relating what the Papists charged them with; unto which Charges, themselves gave no Credit: though as to these last, our Author so sets down their Testimonies, as that his Reader may believe, they are the Testimonies of those Authors themselves, concerning these *Waldenses*, when as they only relate the Charges the Papists

loaded them with; thus in his *Pag.* 286. says he, the *Magdeburgenses*, *Cent.* 11. *Chap.* 5. *Pag.* 240. tell us, *that Beringarius did in the time of Leo the Ninth. about the Year* 1049. *publickly maintain his heresy, which they set down to be denying of transubstantiation, and Baptism to little ones.* Now an incautelous Reader, would think these *Magdeburgenses* themselves, had set down these things to be *Beringarius* his heresies, when as they only tell us, what the Papists charged him with, the truth of which charge, themselves believed not. So again in his *Pag.* 290. says he, speaking of *Peter Bruis*, another worthy Minister among the *Waldenses*, whose Doctrines and Positions for which he suffered, we have recorded by the *Magdeburgenses*, and *Lucas Osiander*, among which, we find those about Baptism, &c.

Here again ordinary Readers unacquainted with these Histories, may think they set down these to be the Doctrines and Positions, for which this worthy man suffered, when as they only set down what the Papists charged him with. And what Credit is to be given to the Papists, let all men judge.

But it may be, it will be said they did not only charge them with denying of Infant-Baptism, but some of them at least wrote largely in Confutation of these Doctrines and Positions, and surely that they would never have done, unless they had certainly known them to hold and maintain them: To that I would only say; I suppose our Author would think himself, and his party hardly dealt with, if all the Tenets and Practises charged upon them by some of their Opposers, and

in

in the confutation of which, and that as their Tenets and Practiſes they have largely written, ſhould be believed as true of them. Would he be willing that men ſhould believe that to Baptize naked is the ordinary practice of all, yea, or the generality of Anabaptiſts, becauſe Mr. *Baxter* hath ſpent ſome pages, to ſhew the evil of that practice.

Alas, how common, yea too common is it for men, and that ſometimes good men too, ſuddenly to take up ungrounded reports concerning the Opinions and Practiſes of thoſe who diſſent from them, and then apply themſelves to a zealous confutation of ſuch Opinions and Practiſes, alas, if ſuch things may go for proof, who may not be proved to hold what their ſouls have abhorred, or to reject what they have zealouſly aſſerted, and lived in the belief and practice of,

Secondly, Other of his Teſtimonies deſerve no credit, or regard, in reſpect of the Teſtimonies themſelves, thus to inſtance in thoſe Teſtimonies produced out of Authors living ſince the Fifth Century, as *Willifrid*, *Strabo*, *Boemius*, *Ludovicus Vives*, or any other Contemporary with, or conſequent unto them, to prove that Infant-Baptiſm was not practiſed in the primitive times, or firſt ages of the Church.

What ever they ſay of that import, yet no rational man can give any credit to their words, they producing no Authorities, offering no Reaſons upon which they grounded their aſſertions. It is true, the laſt mentioned, *viz. Ludovicus Vives*, who ſaith as our Author relates his words, *Pag.* 88. and of whoſe Teſtimony great uſe is

made by the men of his perſwaſion, *that none were Baptized of old, but thoſe that were of Age, who did not only underſtand what the myſtery of the water meant, but deſired the ſame*, he ſeems to have bottomed this Aſſertion upon a twofold ground.

First, That as he ſuppoſed they continued to Baptize the Adult in *Italy* even in his days.

Secondly, His other Ground ſeems to have been the propoſal of Queſtions, (a cuſtom then in uſe) unto Infants at their Baptiſm, which were anſwered by their Sureties for them: But now that theſe Grounds are too weak to bear his Aſſertion is evident. For,

First, As for his firſt Ground, it was his mere miſtake, there was no ſuch practice of Baptizing the Adult, excluſive of Infants in *Italy* in his days, and therefore *Bellarmin* citing this paſſage out of *Ludovicus Vives*, leaves out this Ground, knowing (himſelf being an Italian) the falſity of it, as *Gerard* obſerves, *Tom.* 4. *Pag.* 119.

Secondly, For his other Ground, it proves nothing, in as much as that cuſtom of propoſing Queſtions to Infants had its riſe, not from the way of procedure in primitive times towards the ſeed of believing Parents, as grown up, but from the cuſtom of interrogating the Adult, converted from among the heathen, antecedent to their Baptiſm; whereunto ſome conceive the Apoſtle *Peter* alludes, when Infants were alſo Baptized: So that as he had no true Ground for his Aſſertion, ſo the other, whoſe Teſtimonies are of the ſame import, offer no ground, for what they do aſſert, we have only their bare words; how they came

came to know what they affirm, they tell us not; and that they had indeed no real Ground for what they ſay, is ſufficiently evident from what hath been already ſaid, and will more fully appear hereafter.

Now, who can give any credit to a few obſcure Authors, when they have only their naked Aſſertions without any ſhew of proof, and for which, it evidently appears they had no Ground. Now then, conſidering our Authors great unfaithfulneſs in reference to his Authorities, the apparent uſeleſneſs and inſignificancy of ſo great a part of them, as to his purpoſe; the incredibility and unregardableneſs of others, that ſpeak more home and full to his purpoſe; ſurely the great variety and multiplicity of his Quotations, cannot much move any rational or unbyaſſed perſons. And hence, to add any thing more with reference to them may ſeem ſuperfluous, yet let me juſt mention two things more.

And therefore Fourthly, Conſider, which our Author himſelf calls us to do, of how little force humane Teſtimonies are, for the weakning or eſtabliſhing any Doctrine or Practice in the minds and Judgments of thoſe, in whom that prophecy takes place, *they ſhall wait for the Law at his (id eſt) Chriſts Mouth. Si quid dicitur abſque ſcriptura claudicat auditorum cogitatio*, ſaith Chryſoſtom, and that of *Auſtin* is known, *alios ita lego, ut quantalibet ſanctitate, doctrinaque præpolliant, non adeo verum putem quia ipſi ita ſenſerunt, ſed quia mihi vel per illos Authores canonicos, vel probabili ratione quod à veritate non abhorreant perſuadere potuerunt.* And ſurely to note it by the way, nei-

ther of theſe would take up Infant-Baptiſm merely as a tradition: It is Divine Authority that can only eſtabliſh the minds of ſincere Chriſtians; the Judgment of this or that man is of no great weight to thoſe who have choſen Chriſt, as their teacher, and Governour, as well as their Prieſt to ſave them. It is true, in matters of Fact, credible witneſſes are to be regarded, and in doubtful caſes, it gives no little eaſe to the mind, to be credibly informed in the practice of the Church throughout all Ages paſt.

Laſtly, Let it be conſidered, that would we appeal to, and put the deciſion of the preſent controverſie into the hands of humane Authors, how infallibly it would be determined on our ſide; for this I dare appeal to Mr. *Danvers* himſelf, at leaſt to his book. But to paſs from this, from what hath been ſaid, It evidently appears to how little purpoſe our Author hath beſtowed ſo great pains; and that at laſt, as he and all that expect ſatisfaction in and about the practice Controverted, muſt, ſo we freely do appeal from Humane to Divine Teſtimonies. And anſwerably, I ſhall proceed to the examination of what he hath ſaid from Scripture in confirmation of the one, and the other of his Aſſertions.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Wherein his Six Particulars, to prove that the Baptiſm of Believers is only Chriſts Ordinance of Baptiſm, are examined their Weakneſs and Vanity fully diſcovered.

THe Firſt is this, (*viz.*) *That the Baptizing of Believers, is only to be eſteemed Chriſts Ordinance of Baptiſm*, this he attempts to prove.

1. From Chriſts poſitive inſtitution and Commiſſion commanding of it; and having recited the words of the Commiſſion, he concludes, *Here we have this plain order of Chriſt laid down.*

1. *That men ſhould be taught the doctrine of Faith.*

2. *That being ſo taught they ſhould be baptized.*

3. *That they ſhould in his School or Church, whereof they are then made members, be inſtructed in every thing elſe they ought to learn.*

With reference unto which, I may ſay in *Jobs* words to his friend *Bildad*: *How haſt thou helped him that has no power? How ſaveſt thou the arm that hath no ſtrength?* Job 26. 2. Can *our Author* think that the bare recital of a Text of Scripture, that hath been anſwered over and over, again and again with a crude, *where we have this plain order of Chriſt laid down*, can ſatisfie an impartial enquiring mind, that Baptiſm

Baptiſm muſt neceſſarily, and that univerſally be adminiſtred exactly according to this order here laid down? Surely it concerns thoſe that will plead the Cauſe of Believers Baptiſm, in oppoſition to that of Infants, both to ſhew the inſufficiency of thoſe anſwers given, and alſo evince the neceſſary excluſion of Infants from Baptiſm by this Commiſſion, as expreſt and laid down in the order inſiſted upon. May ſuch inſipid repetitions, and crude aſſertions determine Controverſies; thoſe whoſe lot it is to ſpeak laſt, will infallibly carry the Cauſe, and have the Truth determined on their ſide: whence I might fairly diſmiſs this his firſt particular, with only this reply: 'Tis fully anſwered already. But though I have largely ſpoken to the arguings of our opponents from this Commiſſion elſewhere; yet becauſe they inſiſt ſo much upon it, and ſeem to think that the bare recital of it is ſufficient to eſtabliſh their practice; I ſhall conſider it a little further, and lay down a threefold concluſion with reference to it.

Infants Baptiſm from heaven pag. 288. pag. 290.

1. That this Commiſſion (Inſtitution, it is not) taken abſtractly in it ſelf: does not neceſſarily exclude Infants from Baptiſm: And if it do not neceſſarily exclude them, they may be Baptized (ſuppoſing their Baptiſm elſewhere in Scripture warranted) notwithſtanding our Lord Chriſt has expreſt himſelf as he has done, and that this Commiſſion does not neceſſarily exclude Infants from Baptiſm is ſufficiently evident theſe two ways.

1. From

1. From the general acknowledgement of our oppoſers themſelves; they Univerſally, for ought I have yet underſtood from any of them, profeſs that in caſe Infant-Baptiſm could be clearly proved from any other place of Scripture, they would readily own, and practice it: which would be abſurd, in caſe this Commiſſion did neceſſarily limit Baptiſm to Believers: For that would be to ſuppoſe that the Scriptures might warrant a practice in contradiction to themſelves. And how vain is the bare recital of a Scripture, which themſelves grant does not neceſſarily prove, what it is produced for the proof of.

2. This is evident, becauſe as here is no expreſs mention of Infants; So no Word, Phraſe or Clauſe, that can be rationally interpreted, as neceſſarily excluding them. I know it will be ſaid, *That our Lord Chriſt not mentioning of them, together with the order expreſt, for the adminiſtration of baptiſm, is ſufficient ground to conclude that they were excluded.* But to that, I anſwer, That that is no ſufficient ground to conclude they are excluded, will undeniably appear from a double conſideration.

1. That it is poſſible Chriſt may have given this Commiſſion, only with reference to the adult, and may have ſufficiently declared his will concerning the Baptiſm of Infants, in other parts of his word: which ſuppoſe we ſhould affirm he has; As our oppoſers would have *the order pleaded for*, exactly obſerved by us; ſo no prejudice would ariſe to our Cauſe thereby, ſeeing our only enquiry then muſt be, whether Chriſt has

in

in any part of his word warranted the Baptism of Infants. For I suppose no man will deny that Christ may declare his mind, as to the administration of Baptism, to some in one part of his word; and his Mind and Will as to its administration unto others in another. Whence it is undeniable, that Infants are not necessarily excluded from Baptism by this Commission. Suppose they are not included in it; yet its impossible to evince their exclusion by it, seeing it is possible it may wholly respect Subjects of a different Species. But

2. That our Lord Christ might not, as it is certain he did not intend this Commission, as fully and absolutely directive of his Apostles and Ministers in the Administration of these Ordinances of Preaching and Baptizing, unto the administration of which they are in the general commissioned and appointed: 'Tis no way necessary; (neither can I think our opposers will dare to affirm that it is.) that our Lord Christ should expressly declare his whole mind in any part of his word, no not in the Commission it self, for the administration of them: Concerning the administration of any of his Ordinances, he may give out a more general Commission warranting their Administration and yet further Directions elsewhere, relating both to the administrators, manner of Administration, and Subjects to whom they are to be Administred. And hence it will undeniably follow, though Infants are not expressly mentioned in this Commission, yet they may be included and comprehended in it. Because though the Will of Christ concerning them,

is not plainly here declared, yet it may be found among the various further directions he has elsewhere given, relating to the administration of those two Ordinances, of Preaching, and Baptizing: And that our Lord Christ never intended this Commission, as fully directive of the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel in the execution of it, is fully evident from the indeterminableness of all questions and cases relating to the right administration of the fore-mentioned Ordinances by the Commission it self, I shall instance in these Five or Six,

1. How the Nations were to be *Discipled*, whether only by teaching them, or by Baptizing them? Some have thought (whose Judgment yet I approve not(that Baptism is appointed as the means by which the Nations should be Discipled or made Disciples; and plenty of instances may be brought to shew that the participle is frequently used to denote the means by which any end is accomplished, and why it may not be so used here, our Opposers will be hard put to it to evince from the Commission it self.

2. Who among the Nations or among those to whom the Gospel is preached, ought to be accounted Disciples, and as such the proper subjects of Baptism? We know what a contest has been among some, what that Faith or Embracement of the Gospel is that qualifies men for Baptism, neither is it possible for our opposers to determine that question from the commission it self.

3. Whether the Nations were to be Baptized as discipled, or as men? Neither does this question

ſtion admit of an eaſie deciſion from the commiſſion it ſelf, (though from other Scriptures it does) ſeeing that Pronoun, them, does evidently refer to Nations as its proper antecedent, whether we tranſlate μαθητεύσατε, teach or make diſciples as has been elſewhere proved. Pag. 291.

4. After what manner Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred, whether by dipping, or by pouring, or ſprinkling water upon the face or body of the Party Baptized: That Baptiſm be adminiſtred after a right manner, *our Author* looks upon as eſſential to that Ordinance, and conſequently that a defect therein nullifies it, and makes it no Ordinance of Chriſt; yet that the word uſed in the Commiſſion does not determine what the manner ſhould be, is certain paſt all rational exception. *Our Author* muſt unavoidably take the aſſiſtance of other Scriptures, for the determining that controverſie, and yet muſt leave it in *medio* when he has done.

5. Whether only Males, or both Males and Females ſhould be Baptized is not expreſt in, neither is it determinable from the Commiſſion it ſelf, αὐτοῖς tranſlated *them* being of the maſculine gender, may ſeem to reſtrain Baptiſm, only to Males, and is as clear a ground, for excluding Females, as the order laid down by Chriſt is for the excluding of Infants.

6. Whether Adult Perſons only upon their Diſcipleſhip, or they and their Infant ſeed with them, are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm; and ſeeing that we muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to other revelations that our Lord Chriſt has made of his Will, relating to theſe two Ordinances of Preaching;

Preaching, and Baptizing, for the determining the Five former queſtions or caſes. Let *our Author*, or any other ſhew any ſolid reaſon, why we may not do the ſame for the determining this laſt, which I ſhall expect *ad Græcas calendas*. From what hath been ſaid, it undenyably appears that this Commiſſion, as abſtractly taken in it ſelf, is not a full and compleat direction for the right diſcharge of thoſe duties, it doth more generally authorize and require the performance of. Whence will follow, as ſhining with a noon-like light, the truth of this firſt concluſion, That the Commiſſion does not exclude, but on the other hand may include the Baptiſm of Infants, though they are not mentioned in it, yet the Will of our Lord Chriſt concerning them may be, as we affirm it is, ſufficiently declared in thoſe other rules and directions, relating to the due diſcharge of it. And this Firſt Concluſion (the truth of which appearing with ſo much clearneſs of evidence) does ſo fully anſwer and obviate all arguments and objections pleadable from this Commiſſion, againſt the practice we contend for, that I might well diſmiſs this firſt Argument without any further reply. But if any ſhall yet ſay ſurely if it had been the Will of our Lord Chriſt, that Infants ſhould have been Baptized, he would have plainly declared it.

Anſw. To that I anſwer, that it was vaſtly more neceſſary, that ſeeing it was his Will that Females as well as Males ſhould be Baptized, he ſhould have plainly expreſſed that; and yet we ſee he hath not done it. Yea, let me ſay, of which more hereafter, that in caſe it had been the will

of

of our Lord Christ, that Infants should not be Baptized, it had been much more necessary that he should have plainly declared that; than, it being his Will they should be Baptized, it was necessary he should plainly declare that: So that there is no reason why it should seem strange to any that upon supposition of its being the Will of Christ, that Infants should be Baptized, yet he hath not plainly expresst it in the Commission. We see there are other things that it is as necessary, yea, and more necessary, that they should have been plainly expresst, and yet they are not; yea, the very not mentioning Infants, does strongly imply his Will that they should be Baptized, in as much as had it been his Will that they should not be Baptized, it had been vastly more necessa- he should have clearly expresst it, than it being his will they should, he should plainly expres that. But for the further satisifyiug of this scruple, I shall lay down a Second Coucluſion.

2. That our Lord Christ having else-where so fully reveiled his will concerning the Infant-seed of his people, both as to their interest in the Covenant, and right to the seal and token thereof; the Commission though not expresly mentioning them, yet does sufficiently warrant and authorize the Ministers of the Gospel to Baptize them, as well as the Adult upon their profession of Faith. For the clearing up and illustration of this, let either of these two suppositions be put.

1. That God had sent his Prophets or any of them, having the first Testament administration, to preach the Gospel, as then reveiled unto the heathens or any Nation among them in order unto the

the uniting of them to, or incorporation of them in the Jewish Church: Or,

2. That he had continued Circumcision under the Gospel Administration, either of which things he might have done, had it so pleased him. Now I would ask any rational man, whether this very Commission, only substituting Circumcision in the room of Baptism, had not sufficiently warranted the Circumcision of Infants as well as grown persons, though they had not been expressly mentioned? had it not been enough to have said, Go Teach or Disciple all Nations, and let them be circumcised to the Lord? would any in either of these cases have scrupled whether Infants should have been circumcised upon that ground, that their Circumcision was not expressly mentioned? Surely no scruple in either of these cases would have ever entred into the hearts of men: And why any scruple should now arise seeing the Covenant is one and the same, only there is a substitution of Baptism in the room of Circumcision, as the sign or token of it, no satisfactory account can be given. But yet to make things more plain let me put this one supposition more.

Suppose our Lord Christ had in more words exprest himself in this Commission thus, *Go teach or disciple all Nations baptizing them, for the Covenant with the promises thereof, shall now be extended to, and established with both the Jews and Gentiles and their households, in special their Children, as it hath hitherto been to and with the Jews in special:* Had he thus exprest himself, he had not come much short of mentioning Infants: Why,

let but Scriptures be compared together, and it is *tantamount*, it is all one as if he had ſo expreſt himſelf. Says *Peter* to thoſe awakened Jews, *Repent and be Baptized, for the promiſe is to you and your children*: Says *Paul* to a Gentile, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be ſaved and thy houſe.* Now lay the words of theſe two Apoſtles together, and ſuppoſe them ſpoken by either of them, at one and the ſame time, and that both to Jews and Gentiles, alike awakened to a ſenſe of their ſin and miſery; and it had been all one as if he ſhould have ſaid, *Repent and believe, and thereby become the diſciples of Chriſt, and be baptized, for then the promiſe of Salvation is to you*, that is, it does appertain *to you and to your children and houſholds.* And theſe words, as thus ſpoken, muſt needs be ſpoken by vertue and in purſuance of the Commiſſion they had received from Chriſt, and conſequently they muſt needs have warrant from the Commiſſion thus to ſpeak. From whence it undeniably follows, that ſo much is virtually included in the Commiſſion: And it is all one as if Chriſt had expreſt himſelf in the Commiſſion, in the very words or to the ſence afore declared. And what attempts our oppoſers make to obſcure the evidence that theſe Scriptures taken ſingly and ſeverally give to the practice of Infant-baptiſm; the ſame they might as rationally have made, in caſe our Lord Chriſt had ſo expreſt himſelf in the Commiſſion: Let truth appear never ſo plainly ſome will cavil againſt it. But poſſibly ſome will yet ſay, If Infants ſhould be Baptized, then the Order of Chriſt is croſſed.

Anſw.

Answ. To this I shall say only in the general, that Christs order cannot be crossed by the observation of those rules and directions himself has given for the guidance of his Ambassadors, in the discharge of that duty required in this Commission; as the Baptism of Women no way opposes the mind of Christ, he having elsewhere given direction for their Baptism, though this Commission, according to the letter, only respects men; so the Baptism of Infants no way crosses Christs order, he having elsewhere declared his Will that they should be Baptized, though according to the letter the Commission might seem only to respect the Adult. But that I may give more full satisfaction to this objection, I shall lay down a third Conclusion.

Concluf. 3. That notwithstanding it is the will of Christ that Infants should be Baptized, yet it was very rational, yea necessary, that he should express this Commission in and according to the order he hath done. For let but three things be considered.

1. What was the state and condition of the Nations to whom the Apostles were now sent; they were in a state of darkness and ignorance; wholly estranged from God and his ways. Hence the preaching of the Gospel antecedently to the administration of Baptism was absolutely necessary: The Parents must be discipled before Baptism could be regularly administred, either to themselves or to their Children.

2. Consider the gradual procedure the Gospel should, and answerably has made in subduing the Nations unto Christ; there always has been and

still is some Nations to be discipled and brought home to Christ, and all attempts to disciple them and bring them unto Christ, must be by first preaching the Gospel to them: The discipleship of Parents, still preparing the way to their own and their Childrens Baptism. Hence this Commission as exprest according to this order was necessary, not only for the Apostles who were to begin the work of discipling the Nations, but for all Ministers in succeeding ages, as they should be called out to perfect that work.

3. Consider, that when Nations are discipled, yet the preaching of the Gospel has a precedency to the administration of Baptism; the seed of believers Baptized in their Infancy, must be taught and thereby brought to a sincere embracement and performance of the conditions of the Covenant, into which as the seed of such Parents they were afore received in order to their conveying unto their Children a right to the Covenant, and Baptism as the seal and token thereof. Now then let but these three Conclusions be laid together, and I shall freely appeal to all rational men, whether this Commission can with any shew of reason be interpreted as restraining Baptism to Believers only, to the exclusion of their Infant-seed. We see the Commission does not necessarily exclude Infants; it does sufficiently warrant their Baptism, though they are not expresly mentioned; and it was necessary, though the Will of Christ be that they should be Baptized, yet that he should express the Commission according to the order he has done. But to proceed.

2. *Our Author* argues from the Apostles doctrine: And 3. To

3. To joyn theſe two arguments together. from the Example and Practice of the Primitive Saints, the ſum of both which arguments amounts to thus much:

If the Apoſtles in their Doctrine did teach, that believers ſhould be Baptized, and there is no inſtance to be found of any other teaching; and in conformity to this Doctrine, many Believers are recorded to be baptized, and no inſtance of any Infants; then believers Baptiſm is only Chriſts Ordinance of Baptiſm: But the antecedent is true, therefore the conſequent.

Anſw. To which I would only ſay four things.

1. That the Apoſtles did in their doctrine teach that the promiſe of ſalvation did belong, and conſequently that the Covenant of Grace, in which that promiſe is conteined, is ſtill extended to the Houſes or Families of believers, and that as ſuch.

2. That they did exhort perſons to be Baptized upon that account, that the promiſe did belong to them: And if ſome ought to be Baptized upon the account of their intereſt in the promiſe, then all that have a like intereſt in the promiſe may be Baptized upon the account of that their intereſt. Theſe two things have been ſufficiently proved elſe-where. And hence, though the Apoſtles did not in expreſs terms teach Infant-baptiſm, yet their Doctrine does neceſſarily imply it.

Infant-Baptiſm from Heaven Chap. 6. See alſo Chap. 10. pag. 261. to 271.

3. That they did Baptize whole houſholds, and that ſometimes ſuch in which we read not of any converted ſave only the Heads or Chief Governours, which, eſpecially conſidering the two

foregoing particulars, makes it vastly more probable, that they did baptize some Infants, than the silence of the Scriptures, as to particular instances of Infants being baptized, that they did not baptize them. When the Apostles shall positively assert that the promises of the Covenant do belong to the houses of Believers, and that as such; and then in their doctrine lay interest in the promise as a sufficient ground for the application of Baptism; and now shall baptize several households, in some of which there is no intimation that any were Believers, save only the Heads or chief of them. Surely here is a vastly more probable ground to conclude, that as in their doctrine they did teach, so they did practice Infant-baptism, than the *Scriptures* barely not recording the Baptism of any Infants, is to conclude that they did not. Why may not the Scriptures not mentioning the faith of the household, be as strong an argument to prove that some in such households had not a personal Faith, as their not mentioning the Baptism of Infants is to prove that no Infants were baptized. But to pass that

4. That the Scriptures not recording that the Apostles did preach or practice Infant-Baptism, is no argument to prove that they did not both preach and practise it: Could our Author have produced any one Scripture wherein the Apostles in their doctrine did exclude Infants from Baptism, or in their practice did refuse to Baptize them, he had said somewhat to his purpose; and till that can be done, the multiplication of Scriptures, which alone concern the Baptism of believers, signifie just nothing; inasmuch as they might

teach

teach and administer Baptism, as is declared in those Scriptures, and yet teach the doctrine of, and practise Infant-baptism also.

4. *Our Author* further argues from the spiritual ends and uses of Baptism: And thus he seems to argue, If believers are only capable of the Spiritual ends, and uses of Baptism, then they are the only proper Subject of Baptism; but the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequent.

Answ. Would he have concluded any thing to his purpose by this argument, he should have proved at least one of these two things.

1. That Infants are not capable of any of those ends with reference unto which Baptism is appointed Or: else,

2. That none ought to be baptized, unless capable of all the end and uses for which Baptism is appointed: but neither of these things does he or can he rationaly affirm; and hence this argument signifies as little as any of his former. I shall therefore wave the particular Consideration of those several ends aud uses of Baptism mentioned by him, and only in brief prove these two things. Only remember that at present my work is not to prove Infant-baptism, only to shew the insufficiency and weakness of this argument, taken from the uses and ends of Baptism, to prove that none ought to be Baptized but only believers.

1. That infants are capable of some of the uses and ends with reference unto which Baptism is appointed. The truth of this will appeare above any rational doubt, by the bare men-

tioning some of the uses and ends, of that Ordinance. Take only these two.

1. To seal confirm and ratify the Covenant with the Promises thereof, unto those with whom it is established: And.

2. To give those a solemn admission into the visible Church, who have an antecedent right thereunto: that these are two of the grand ends and uses of Baptism has been elsewhere proved, and is granted by our Author himself. Now that infants are capable of both these ends and uses of Baptism is past all rational doubt. If God has extended his Covenant to them, why may he not seal, confirm and ratify it unto them by an outward sign and token? if it be his will they should have a place in his Church or Family, why may they not be solemnly admitted thereunto by Baptism; But not to spend time in the proofe of that which no body will or can deny. Therefore.

2. That Infants may be baptized, as capable of some, though it should be granted that they are incapable of other, of the ends and uses of Baptism; this is secured, both by the acknowledgment of *our opposers themselves* and it's own light and evidence from any opposition, especially from them. *Our Authour* affirms (how truely may be seen after) That Circumcision was applyed to *Abraham* for such uses and ends of which none of his seed were capable, so both Mr. *Tombes* and himself (with what consistency with his own Principles *ipse viderit*:) acknowledge that Circumcision did represent and signify Heart-circumcision, which

it

it could no more do to Infants, then Baptiſm can Regeneration, yet that hindred not its application unto them: And if Circumciſion, the former token of the Covenant might be applied to Infants as capable of ſome, though incapable of other ends and uſes, with reference unto which it was appointed, why it may not be ſo with Baptiſm no rational account can be given: yea, though we ſet aſide their reſpective reference to the Covenant as the Signs and Tokens thereof; if one Ordinance may be appointed for, and applyed to ſeveral *Subjects* with reference to ſeveral ends and uſes, ſome of which all the Subjects are capable of, others only ſome of them, why may it not be ſo with any other Ordinance? But further; That our Lord Chriſt may appoint the application of Baptiſm to Infants, as capable of ſome of the ends and uſes of it, though it ſhould be granted they are not capable of others, is undeniable from the ſole conſideration of his ſovereign Lordſhip over his owne houſe: It's true, could it be Proved that they are ſimply and abſolutely incapable, of any of the ends and uſes of Baptiſm, it were rational to conclude our Lord Chriſt had not appointed its application to them: But to grant that Infants are capable of ſome, yea the main and Principal Ends and uſes of Baptiſm, and yet to argue againſt their Baptiſm meerly from their incapability of other ends and uſes of it; as it is a wild way of arguing, ſo it not a little reflects upon the ſoverign Power and Authority of him from whoſe mouth it is the duty of all mortals *to*

wait

wait for the Law. Will he appoint Baptism to be applied to them for such ends as they are cappable of, though they should be incapable of others, who may say unto him, *what doest thou?*

5. The difference between the New and Old Testament-dispensation is urged as another Argument to prove that the Baptism of Beleivers is only Christs Ordinance of Baptism. And there is a two-fold difference asigned by *our Author* between the Old and New Testament-dispensations. The first respects the Subjects, or Persons of whom the Church under the first Testament was, and under the New is constituted and made up: Under the first Testament they were, saies he, *the fleshly seed of Abraham*, whom he conceives might, and that as such without a personal work of Regeneration be admitted into, and continued then in the Church. Hence that Church was only *a Carnal Church*, as he speaks, *pag.* 221. But now the Subjects, or Persons of which the Church under the New Testament is and ought to be constituted and made up, are and ought to be *professed Beleivers*, and consequently visibly the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham.*

2. The other Difference he assigns between these two Dispensations respects the Worship, then and now to be tendred up unto God; Then he conceives the Worship both in respect of the Matter of it, and Meanes or outward Ordinances, in and by which it was to be performed, was sutable to the nature of the Church; as the Church was a Carnal Church, so the Worship was external, performed in and by carnal Ordinance: *They then,*

then, says he, *had a Worldly Sanctuary, Carnal Ordinances, a temporal Priesthood, and a multitude of Ceremonies:* but now under the New Testament, it is, says he, otherwise, *now the Worship is spiritual and the Ordinances are spiritual; and this worship must be offered up to God by an unchangeable Priesthood.* And hence he conceives, that however Infants might be admitted into the Church under the Old Testament, yet now they ought not: Now 'tis most meet and sutable, that only a spiritual Seed should attend the spiritual Worship, and spiritual Ordinances.

Answ. As for this Change made in the new Testament-dispensation, whereby it differs from the Old, as it respects the worship to be performed, whether in regard of the matter of it, or the Ordinances in and by which it is to be performed, how either Infants or their Baptism should be concerned in it, is impossible to imagine; they are as capable to the full of holding Communion with the Church now in spiritual Ordinances, and to offer up a spiritual worship by an unchangable Priesthood, as they were to hold communion with that carnal Church, as *our Author* calls it, or to partake of those carnal Ordinances, or to worship God by that temporary Priesthood: That is, they neither were nor are capable of the one nor the other: And then how their Baptism or Church-membership, should be any way concerned in this change, *our Author* neither does nor can shew; neither can I well think that himself did think these things would signifie any thing to any rational man: But these terms and phrases of worldly Sanctuary, carnal Ordinances, *&c.* might

might excite paſſions in perſons of weaker Judgments, and thereby his Cauſe might be ſomewhat promoted among ſuch. And therefore that which we are here alone concerned in, is this change in the New Teſtament diſpenſation, whereby it differs from that under the Old Teſtament, as it reſpects the ſubjects or perſons of which the Church then and now was and is to be conſtituted and made up of. And this we abſolutely deny, that the New Teſtament diſpenſation does ſo differ as is here ſuppoſed from the Old: We abſolutely deny that fleſhly diſcent from *Abraham* was a ſufficient ground for the admitting or continuing any in the Church under the Old Teſtament beyond his Children, immediately deſcending from his own loins: But the Church was then as now to be conſtituted, or to conſiſt only of *Abraham*'s ſpiritual or myſtical ſeed incluſive of their Infants; and conſequently that Church was a ſpiritual Church or Corporation as the Goſpel Church is. We grant that a greater meaſure of the ſpirit, is granted to the Church, under the New Teſtament, than was under the Old; and anſwerably the true and ſincere members have, or at leaſt may have, ſpiritual life *in more abundance*, as our Lord Chriſt ſpeaks, than the members of the Church ordinarily then had. But as then there were ſome hypocrites, ſo there is ſtill: So as now the Church according to divine appointment, ought to conſiſt of viſible Believers, among whom ſome are ſincere, ſo it was then. In a word, as there was a mixture of *Wheat and Chaff in the floor of Chriſt* then, ſo there is ſtill: But the Church then, might and ought

to

to be denominated a ſpiritual Church or Houſe as it may and ought to be now. So that the New Teſtament diſpenſation, differs not at all from the Old; in regard of the matter or ſubjects the Church is conſtituted or made up of; they were then the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*, including their Infants, and ſo they are ſtill. This ſhall be further manifeſt when I come to the reſolution of that queſtion, Whether Circumciſion was adminiſtred to Believers as Believers, and to their ſeed as ſuch? But yet let me here offer theſe two Arguments to prove that the New Teſtament diſpenſation, does not ſo differ, in reſpect of the matter or ſubjectsof the Church, from the Old, as is pretended.

1. If the ſame attributes may be, and are by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, given to the Church, under the Old Teſtament, that may be and are given to the Church under the New, then the New Teſtament diſpenſation, as it reſpects the matter or ſubjects of the Church, does not ſo differ as is pretended from the Old: But the antecedent is true, therefore the conſequent.

That the antecedent is true (*viz.*) that the ſame attributes, may be and are by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf given to the Church under the Old Teſtament, that may be and are given to the Church under the New, is undenyable, by comparing *Exod.* 19.5,6. with 1 *Pet.*2.9. As the Church now is a *peculiar people unto God*; ſo it was then: As it is now a *royal Prieſthood*; ſo it was then: As it is now an *holy Nation*; ſo it was then.

And from the Holy Ghoſt's thus giving the ame attributes to the Church then; that are given to the Church now, it will undenyably follow,

low, that there is no such change made in the New Testament dispensation as is pretended. Can that Church be denominated a carnal Church any more than the Gospel-Church may, when it was a *peculiar people*, *a royal Priesthood*, *a holy Nation*, as well as the Church now is. But

2. If the Church under the first Testament was the mystical Body of Christ into which Believers under the New Testament are incorporated, and as so incorporated make up and continue the same mystical Body of Christ in the world; then the New Testament dispensation, as it respects the matter or subjects of the Church, does not differ as is pretended from the old: But the former is true, therefore the latter: The antecedent is undenyable from that *Ephes.* 3. 6. from whence the conclusion will necessarily follow. But of this more hereafter. From what has been said, we evidently see, there is no such change of dispensation as our Author supposes, and answerably this argument is of no force at all: And hence for what he after nonsensically talks of *Johns* discharging that privilege of *Abraham*'s natural seed that admitted into the old Church, from any such Rite in the New, it signifies nothing, be his meaning what it will: *John* did not discharge them from any privilege they afore had, only rectifies a mistake they afore lay under. But

6. *Our Author* endeavours to confirm believers Baptism to be the only true Baptism, from the constitution of the Primitive Churches, *They were*, says he, *framed not of ignorant Babes, but of professing men and women:* And this, as he judges, is further evidenced, *by the dedication of the Epistles*

sent

ſent to the Churches, as well as the contents of the ſame.

Anſw. This Argument preſuppoſes, and takes for granted, that which is by many, if not by moſt, denyed (*viz*) That Infants either by Baptiſm are or at leaſt immediately upon their Baptiſm ought to be admitted as members into particular Churches; hence it only concerns ſuch as are of that perſwaſion. I ſhall only ſay theſe two things.

1. That Infants Baptiſm may be ſufficiently proved, though that be, as ſurely it may very rationally be denyed; hence unleſs *our Author* can prove, which he attempts not; (he is better at begging than proving; whence it may be ſaid to him in the Poets words.

——τοὶ μυθοὶ φίλοι ἄνεϱτοι εἰσὶν.)

I was ſaying, unleſs he can prove that Infant-baptiſm does neceſſarily ſuppoſe, and require that they are either by or immediately upon their Baptiſm to be admitted as members into particular Churches, his Arguments ſignifie juſt nothing at all.

2. Suppoſe we ſhould grant him that, yet to ſay no more, his proofs are wholly inſufficient: Infants might be admitted as members of particular Churches, notwithſtanding what he ſaith concerning *the Order directed to in Chriſts Commiſſion*, and what we read concerning *the Apoſtles obſervation of that direction*; *or the unconcernedneſs of Infants, both in the dedications and contents of the Epiſtles ſent to the Churches.*

As for the Commiſſion, and the Apoſtles Practice,

ctice, I have already ſhewd the inſufficiency of the one and the other, to prove believers to be the only true ſubjects of Baptiſm: I ſhall therefore only touch upon the unconcernedneſs of Infants in the dedication of the Epiſtles ſent to the Churches, or in the Epiſtles themſelves,

Unto which I would ſay, If *our Author* judged that that Argument to prove Infant-baptiſm, drawn from their federal holineſs deſerves the left hand, it being ſo lately, not above an hundred and twenty years ago, brought to light, he has no reaſon to be angry, if we give ſomewhat the leſs heed to this Argument, to diſprove the Church members-ſhip of Infants; ſeeing it is as I ſuppoſe, of a much later date, and comes ſhort of that Argument, in point of antiquity, not leſs than an hundred and eighteen years. But for the Argument it ſelf, I would only ask *our Author* theſe two Queſtions,

1: Whether Infants were more concerned in the prophecies and writings of the Prophets, than Infants are in the Epiſtles written to the Church? yet they were members of the Church then.

2. Whether he ſuppoſes, that the Apoſtles would have expreſt themſelves, otherwiſe than they have, had Infants been members of the Churches? But not to waſte time upon ſuch trifles; by what has been ſaid, (for I ſhall ſay no more than what I have done to his humane Authority which makes up his ſeventh Argument) I ſay we may ſee what poor grounds the Antipedobaptiſts have for their firſt aſſertion (*viz.*) that Believers Baptiſm is only Chriſt's Ordinance of Baptiſm. I proceed now to his ſecond.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Wherein the Author's two Firſt Particulars to diſprove Infant-baptiſm are conſidered; with reference unto which two things remarked; a full Enquiry made, whether what ſilence may be truly predicated either of the Scripture or Antiquity, concerning that practice, does not more tend to its eſtabliſhment than overthrow. The Affirmative fully proved.

THat I may haſten to the vindication of thoſe Scripture Grounds which Pedobaptiſts have laid for their judgment and practice from the attempts of our Author to raiſe, at leaſt darken and obſcure them, (which is that I principally intend) I ſhall take the two firſt Arguments or Conſiderations he hath laid down for the diſproof of Infant-baptiſm together; the former of which is drawn from the ſuppoſed total ſilence of the Scriptures; the latter from the alike total ſilence of Antiquity about the practice.

This Firſt Conſideration he thus expreſſeth. *If Infant-baptiſm had been an appointment or ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, there would have been ſome precept, Command or example in Scripture to warrant the ſame: But inaſmuch as the Scripture is ſo wholly ſilent therein, there being not one ſyllable to be found in all the New Teſtament about any ſuch*

practice, it may be concluded to be no Ordinance of Jesus Christ.

His second is thus expresst. *The next thing we shall make appear is, that as there was no Scripture Authority to inforce it, so there was no humane Authority to enjoyn it till above four hundred years after Christ.* And in pursuance of this latter Argument, he undertakes not only to shew the silence of Antiquity as to this practice, but over and above to shew *the time when, the persons by whom, and the ends for which it was instituted and brought into the Church*; wherein had his success been proportionable to his confidence, he had done something considerable, and should (I dare boldly say) have had many hearty thanks from the most zealous assertors of Infant-baptism themselves; and indeed he had well deserved it: but (alas!) how hath he failed, and who can do that which is impossible to be done? Impossibilities will nonplus the wisest and ablest of men, let their diligence and industry be never so great; and therefore it hath been usually said, *Impossibilium nullus est conatus.* Wise men cease endeavours where impossibilities appear: But more directly to my purpose with reference to both these considerations, I shall first remark two things.

Secondly, Inquire, whether what may be truly said of the silence of the Scriptures and Antiquity about the practice supposed, do not make it vastly more probable, that Infants ought, than that they ought not to be Baptized.

First, That which I would remark is, how little *our Author* hath done for the promoting the Cause he hath ingaged in; by all that he hath said

ſaid in purſuance of theſe two Arguments: As for the Scriptures, that they are ſo ſilent as he pretends, hath been ſufficiently evidenced elſewhere, and may be further ſhewed hereafter: As for his various quotations, whereby he would make his Reader believe, either that ſo many Pædobaptiſts have acknowledged the ſilence of the Scriptures; or that ſo many have affirmed that the Adult alone were baptized in the firſt Ages of the Church: What regard is to be had to them may alſo appear from what hath been already ſaid, and ſhall immediately be further conſidered. I ſhall therefore at preſent only a little review the account he gives us of the *time when, the perſons by whom, and the ends for which*, the Baptizing of Infants was *(as he ſaith)* inſtituted and brought into the Church. And thus the whole account he gives us, we have comprized in about fourteen lines at the lower end of his 114 and the upper end of his 115 Pages, and 5 or 6 lines at the lower end of his 117 Page. In brief it is this: *It is true*, ſaith he, *towards the latter end of this Century* (that is the fourth Century) *it is ſaid, that in ſome parts of* Africa, *they did Baptize children*, and quotes the Magdeburgenſes for it; *and that ſome of the Greek Church did begin to approve of it.* Gregory Nazianzen *is ſaid to admit Infants to be Baptized in caſe of neceſſity.* And then he further adds, Jerome *is ſaid to incline to it alſo, after* Origen *and* Cyprian; then in his 117. Page tells us, that, ſpeaking of the Fifth Century, *that was the Age wherein Infant-Baptiſm did receive its ſanction by the decrees of Popes and Councils.* Here's the All that *our Au-*

thor, after his utmoſt enquiry into Antiquity, can ſay about the *time when*, *and the perſons by whom* Infant-baptiſm was Inſtituted. And how well he hath performed his great undertaking let all judge. As for *the time when* Infant-baptiſm had its firſt riſe, he leaves us wholly in the dark; for though he talk at random of its being practiſed by ſome in *Africa* about the latter end of the fourth Century, yet himſelf grants it was practiſed long before that time: for he tells us before, (page 62.) that *Tertullian oppoſed himſelf by ſeveral arguments againſt ſome that affirmed Infant-baptiſm.* Secondly, he quotes *both Chryſoſtom* and *Auſtin*, who (as hath been before taken notice of) were contemporary with Pope *Innocent* and lived in that very age, wherein he would inſinuate Infant-baptiſm received its firſt ſanction, as affirming *that then it was the univerſal practice of the whole Church, and hath been ſo time out of mind.*

3. He himſelf intimates that both *Origen* and *Cyprian* did, if not practice, yet incline to it, for ſo are his words; *Jerome is ſaid to encline to it, after* Origen *and* Cyprian: ſo that *Origen* and *Cyprian* did incline to it, and that they did not only incline to it but alſo practiſe it, is ſufficiently evidenced by other hands. Yea,

4. Himſelf denies not that it was practiſed before, only ſaith, *there was no humane Authority to enjoyn it till above four hundred years after Chriſt.* Which ſignifies juſt nothing. And

5. Let me add this one Obſervation more, that *Pelagius*, in all his conteſts with *Auſtin* about Original ſin, durſt never deny Infant-baptiſm, though

though it had highly ſubſerved his intereſt to have done it; ſeeing that practice was made ſo great uſe of by *Auſtin* for the confirmation of the doctrine of Original ſin oppoſed by him, and the reaſon is given by *Auſtin* himſelf: *Pelagianos non fuiſſe auſos negare Baptiſmum parvulorum quod viderint nimis apertè cum Eccleſiâ totâ pugnandum fuiſſe, ſi eum negarent:* An undenyable evidence that Infant-baptiſm was then univerſally practiſed, and had been ſo for ought what then appeared, from the Apoſtles days: For could he have proved that it had been an innovation, and not the practice of the Church from the Apoſtles days, he would undoubtedly have done it; his cauſe being ſo nearly concerned in it. Se Gerhard de Baptiſmo pag. 576.

Now can *our Author*, or any others think, (nay doth he not expreſly grant the contrary) that that could be the age wherein Infant-baptiſm had its firſt riſe? So that we are yet for ought what *our Author* hath ſaid, utterly at a loſs about the time when it was inſtituted.

As for the perſons by whom it was inſtituted, here we are at as great a loſs, as we are at about the time. Indeed he tells us in ſome parts of *Africa*, they did Baptize Children; this was in the Fourth Century; but he tells us not who they were, and conſequently the Authors of Infant baptiſm are yet to ſeek; and beſides, theſe were not the firſt that Baptized Children, as appears from what he ſaith of *Tertullian:* So that it is evident not only ſome among the Africans and ſome among the Greeks, but ſome among the Latins, yea the univerſal Church, and that before the Fourth

Century, did Baptize Children. And as for thoſe Fathers, *viz. Gregory, Nazianzen*, and *Jerome*, as he doth not affirm them to be the inventors of Infant-baptiſm, only ſaith they inclined to it; ſo it is certain they were not, it being, as confeſſed by himſelf, the univerſal practice of the Church in their days: So that *our Author* himſelf is wholly at a loſs about the time when, and the perſons by whom Infant-baptiſm was inſtituted: We cannot therefore derive its original from men, we muſt ſay it is *from heaven and not of men.*

As for the end for which he ſuppoſeth it to be inſtituted, if he aſſign any, it is the taking away of Original ſin. But ſeeing neither the time when, nor the perſon by whom it was introduced into the Church can be found, we may ſafely conclude it is no other than the Inſtitution of Chriſt himſelf, and not brought in by men for any ſuch End; only ſome through miſtakes did in after ages attribute too much to it with reference to that end. From all, how little hath *our Author* ſaid in purſuance of theſe two firſt arguments for the promotion of his Cauſe

Secondly, Let it be conſidered, how greatly he hath abuſed and wronged, as his Authors, ſo his Readers, himſelf and his cauſe, in what he hath ſaid. He hath greatly abuſed his Authors, either in Fathering that upon them which they never ſaid, or groſſely preverting their words, contrary to what they Evidently declared to be their ſence and meaning in them. This he tells *us* (*Page* 108.) *That it was the known Cuſtom of the Primitive Church to Baptize the Adult, and*

them

them only, at leaſt for the firſt ages, is fully atteſted by Euſebius, Beatus Rhenanus, &c. whereas not one of them, except *Ludovicus Vives* (of whom I have ſpoken before) ſay any ſuch thing. As for *Beatus Rhenanus* hee either ſpeaks of Heathens, or elſe his words declare, he was a man that ſpake either he knew not, or cared not what. Let their Teſtimonies be read as quoted by himſelf, *Page* 63. 68. 73. 79. and 88. They ſay indeed that the aged were or ought to be Baptized, (which no body denies) but they ſay not they only were Baptized. So for at leaſt vaſtly the Major part of thoſe he quotes, *Pages* 98. 99. and 101. as acknowledging that there is no command, precept, or example in the Scriptures for the Baptizing of Infants; whereas they only acknowledge that there is no expreſs command or precept, that is a command or precept *in totidem verbis*, nor any expreſs mention of any Infants being Baptized. This he wreſts, and would have his reader believe, they acknowledged there is noe warrant from Scrito Baptize them. And what greater abuſe or wrong can be done to any Authors, than thus groſſely to prevert and wreſt their words. Can any man think he had any true actual fear of God before his Eyes when he wrote theſe Pages? And by thus abuſing and wronging his Authors, he hath greatly wronged his Reader, himſelf and his owne cauſe; ſo that whereas he boaſteth in his 107. and 108. *Pages* what he had gained by his learned Authorities; the Truth is, he hath only gained ſuch a blot to his one reputation, as (unleſs publick repentance be manifeſted)

will never be wiped off in this world; however (supposing him to have the truth of Grace) he may obtain Pardon hereafter. And how highly injurious hath he been to the cause he pleads: for Will not his Book remain as a publick Evidence of the Forgeries, Falsities, unjust and injurious dealings, the opposers of Infant-baptism are forced (for want of any Scripture or rational ground) to make use of, for the upholding and maintaining their Opinion and Practice. And the truth is, had I not some reason to think the Author is real in what he pleads for, I should much suspect him to be no Friend * to the Anabaptists; be sure he hath given a sore wound to their cause. But.

* *Tuta frequensque via est sub Amici falere nomen.*

Secondly, Let us breifly inquire, whether what may be truely said of the silence of the Scriptures and Antiquity about Infant Baptism, doe not make it vastly more probable that they ought, than that they ought not to be Baptized, This I might greatly enlarge upon, but let only these Five things be well weighed.

First, That in case it had been the will of our Lord Christ that the Covenant-interest of the Infant-seed of his people should have been discontinued, and the application of the token of the Covenant unto them on that ground ceased; it had been, if not absolutely necessary, yet exceeding useful to his Church, that he should have expressely and plainly declared it: How many Considerations offer themselves to Evidence this, let this only be observed; That no alteration ought to be made in or about

about the Covenant beyond what our Lord Christ himself hath made: Hence had he not declared his will, that Females as well as Males should be Baptized, we had had no ground for their Baptism. So on the other hand, seeing he hath not declared his will that the Covenant-interest of, and the application of the token thereof unto the Infant-seed of his people should cease, we ought not to deny them the one or the other. Suppose the new Testament had been wholly silent about the will of Christ relating to Infants, (which yet it is not) we ought wholly to have guided our Judgments and practice relating unto them, by the first Establishment of the Covenant with *Abraham* the Father of the Faithfull; where we Evidently finde the natural seed, and that as such, both of *Abraham*, and all that were according to the true intendment of the Promise to be accounted for his seed, received into the same Covenant, and had the same token applyed to them with their Parents. And who could without hazard of subjecting themselves to his displeasure, make any alteration or change in the Tenour of the Covenant or any thing relating thereunto, beyond what our Lord Christ himself hath made?

Secondly, Let it be seriously considered, how utterly improbable it is, that an alteration of such a vast importance could have been made, unless the will of our Lord Christ had been expresly declared, without some opposition made by the unbelieving Jews, or some doubts and scruples arising in the minds of Believers, especially the converted Jews, about it. Whoso shall attentively

tively read over the ſacred records relating to the New Teſtament-times, and conſider what doubts did ariſe in the minds of Believers about, yea, what oppoſition was made by them, as well as by the unbelieving Jews, againſt changes of a vaſt lower importance, will hardly think this to carry the leaſt or loweſt degree of probability in it. Were they ſo tenacious of the diſtinction of Days and Meats, and would they ſo eaſily part with the Covenant-intereſt of their Chidren? Were they ſo hardly brought to part with Circumciſion it ſelf, though they had Baptiſm ſubſtituted in the room and ſtead thereof? And yet would they without any difficulty at all comply with, not only the taking away the token from their Children, but their intereſt in the Covenant and Promiſes alſo, without the ſubſtitution of any other privilege in leiu thereof: *Credat Appella*; for my own part I cannot do it.

Thirdly, Let it be further conſidered, that there is no error or erronious practice introduced into the Church, but it may be traced up to its firſt riſe, at leaſt the time may be ſhewed from Antiquity, when it was not in being in the Church. This the Lord *Brookes* and others have taken notice of; what a worthy account *our Author* hath given us of the riſe of Infant-baptiſm hath been already declared; neither is it poſſible for any to give a better than himſelf hath done. But

Fourthly, Conſider yet further, that the very firſt mention we have in Antiquity, of any doubts or debates relating to Infant-baptiſm does plainly imply, and preſuppoſe it to have been antecedently

dently practiſed. Let *our Author* or any other produce the firſt mention that is made of any thing of that nature in Antiquity. I doubt not but it will be made evident, that that does preſuppoſe the practice thereof to be in uſe before that time.

Fifthly, Let it yet be conſidered, that the firſt that we find to have ſpoken or written any thing with a direct reference to the practiſing of Infant-baptiſm, was to adviſe and perſwade to the deferring of it. As for *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, though they let fall ſuch paſſages as may be at leaſt a probable ground to believe that it was the practice of the Church in their days, yet they wrote not directly either for, or againſt it.

And as for *Cyprian*, what he wrote about it to *Fidus*, did only relate to the time of its adminiſtration, whether it might be adminiſtred before the eighth day or no. So that *Tertullian* ſeems to be the firſt that wrote with a direct reference to the practice it ſelf. From whence we may rationally conclude, that before *Tertullian* aroſe, the Church had continued from the Apoſtles days in the univerſal practice of Infant-baptiſm. That he found it the general practice of the Church is evident from that kind of oppoſition he makes againſt it; and nothing appears as the leaſt intimation that it was not univerſal; for he wrote nothing againſt the lawfulneſs of the practice, but only perſwades by ſeveral conſiderations, (ſuch as they are) to deferr it.

And here we might again take notice how groſly *our Author* abuſeth both *Tertullian*, and the *Magdeburgenſes*, as relating *Tertullian's* opinion,

nion, he abuſeth both in two things.

Firſt, In ſaying they, that is the *Magdeburgenſes*, tell us, that *Tertullian* did oppoſe himſelf againſt ſome that aſſerted Infant-baptiſm, whereas they only ſay (having given an account of *Cyprian*'s reſolution of the queſtion ſent him from *Fidus*, *viz.* that Infants might be baptized immediately or preſently after they were born, *mox poſt quam editi*) that *Tertullian* thought otherwiſe, *Contra quod tamen Turtullianus cenſuit in libro de baptiſmo:* So that as he did not, ſo they do not ſay that he did, oppoſe himſelf againſt any, only was of a different judgement from *Cyprian* as to to the time of baptizing Infants.

Secondly, *Our Author* groſly abuſeth both, by pretending that they tell us that *Tertullian* oppoſed himſelf againſt Infant-baptiſm abſolutely; whereas they only tell us, that *Tertullian* ſaid the differring of Baptiſm was more profitable according to the Condition, Diſpoſition, and Age of all perſons, eſpecially Infants. Their words are *pro cujuſque inquit, viz. Tertullianus, perſonæ, Conditione, Diſpoſitione, etiam Ætate cunctatio baptiſmi utilior eſt, præcipuè tamen circa parvulos.* So that *Tertullian* only adviſeth to delay the baptiſm of Infants, and that not only theirs, but of all other unmarried perſons.

The next that wrote any thing directly with reference to the practiſing of Infant-baptiſm, ſeems to have been *Gregory Nazianzen* (whom *our Author* again together with the *Magdeburgenſes* groſly abuſeth, (as almoſt which of his Authorities that he cites in favour of his cauſe, doth he not) and it may ſeem he was at leaſt in part of

Ter-

Tertullian's mind, yet withal affirms, that *omni ætati Baptiſma conveníre, that Baptiſm doth agree to every age*: And from the opinion of theſe two men probably it was that ſome Children of believing parents had their Baptiſm deferred, of which *our Author* makes ſo great uſe. But that is by the way. Now let all men judge whether what ſilence may be truly ſpoken of the Scriptures and Antiquity do not make it ſomewhat more than probable, that Infant-baptiſm was the univerſal practice of the Church in the Apoſtles days and the ages immediately ſucceeding: It had been, if not ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary, yet exceeding uſeful that our Lord Chriſt ſhould have plainly declared that his will about the diſcontinuing the Covenant-intereſt of the ſeed of his people, and the ceſſation of the application of the token of the Covenant to them on that account, had it been indeed his will that the one ſhould have been diſcontinued, and the other left off; but no ſuch declaration can be found. How unlikely that ſuch a privilege ſhould be withdrawn from the people of God, and no ſcruple ariſe in any mens minds about it, nor one Scribe, Phariſee, or unbelieving Jew, ſo much as taking the leaſt notice of it, or improving it as an argument againſt the imbracement of the doctrine of Chriſt.

No man can be found as the firſt inventor of this practice of Infant-baptiſm; the firſt mention of it in Antiquity implying, that then it was in uſe, yea the general practice of the Church. The firſt that wrote any thing with a direct reference to the practiſing of it, only uſeth ſome frivolous reaſons

reaſons to perſwade to the delay of it, neither oppoſing that practice as unlawful, nor ſo much as taking the leaſt notice of the novelty of it, or of the practice of the Church to be otherwiſe. Now can any rational man imagine in caſe Infant-baptiſm (as *our Author* pretends) had been hardly yet in uſe, only aſſerted by ſome few in order to the future practice of it, that *Tertullian*, who it ſeems did ſomewhat diſlike it, would have only perſwaded to the deferring of it, and that by ſuch inconſiderable reaſons; and not rather ſet himſelf directly and downright againſt the practice it ſelf, and that as an innovation unheard of hitherto in the Church; he could not be ignorant what the practice of the Church had been.: And had he known that the univerſal practice of the Church had been to baptize the Adult only, he would undoubtedly have urged that, if not as the only, yet as a main argument againſt it, or at leaſt as a main motive to perſwade to the deferring of it. But when ſuch a man as *Tertullian* was, (who ſo fully vnderſtood the affairs of the Church, not only in his own days, but in the ages paſt) ſhall only adviſe to the delay of Infant-baptiſm, and that too only as more profitable, and not at all either oppoſe the practice as unlawful, or ſo much as take the leaſt notice of the practice of the Church in baptizing the Adult only, it is to me (what it may be to others I cannot ſay) little leſs than a full demonſtration that Infant-baptiſm was then the known and approved practice of the Church, yea and had been ſo from the Apoſtles time. Surely a man that is not a ſtranger to all principles of Reaſon had need

of

of ſome very cogent arguments to ſatisfie himſelf that Infant-baptiſm was not practiſed either in the Apoſtles days, or in the ages immediately enſuing. But to proceed

CHAP. IV.

Wherein his third Particular for the diſproving of Infant-Baptiſm is conſidered: In what ſence Tradition is laid by us as a ground of Infant-Baptiſm declared: That ground in the ſence in which it is laid by us, vindicated from Mr. Danvers *his attempts to overthrow it.*

THirdly, the ſuppoſed *erronious grounds both as to fabulous Traditions, and miſtaken Scriptures; upon which the practice of Infant-baptiſm hath been both formerly and laterly* founded, is brought *by our Author* as his third argument or conſideration to diſprove the practice thereof.

Anſw. As for the former ground, *viz.* Tradition, upon which he ſaith the practice of Infant-Baptiſm hath been both formerly, and laterly founded, I ſhall not ſpend much time in the vindication of it; only I might here again detect his diſingenuity and unworthy dealing, yea downright falſities and untruths. Thus he moſt diſingeniouſly and falſly affirms, that the firſt and principal ground that hath been laid for this practice, hath been Eccleſiaſtical and Apo-

Apoſtolical Tradition; and I doubt not but he thought the very name of a Tradition would conſiderably advantage his Cauſe; thoſe that will but attentively read his own Book, muſt have a very great Charity for him not to believe that he affirms this contrary to his own knowledge. For

Firſt, himſelf acknowledgeth, that the 19. *Mat.* 14. *was of old called the Scripture-Canon for Infant-Baptiſm*, *Page* 177; ſo again *Page* 260.

Secondly, he knows full well that Circumciſion was frequently pleaded for it.

Thirdly, he knows *Auſtin* denies it to be a Sacrament without the word of Inſtitution, *Page* 103.

Laſtly, he cannot but know how theſe Fathers underſtood the word Tradition. See Doctor *Ames* his firſt Book, ſixth Chapter, Page 67. *de Verbo Dei*, where he ſheweth how the Ancients uſed this term Tradition, quoting that known paſſage out of *Cyprian*, *Si aut in Evangelio præcipitur*, *aut Apoſtolorum Epiſtolis*, *aut actibus*, *continetur*, *obſervatur certè hæc ſancta traditio*. But this is *ad hominem*, *non ad rem*. I ſhall therefore paſs it by, and only ſhew how far Infant-Baptiſm is founded upon Tradition, and then take a brief account in one particular inſtance, how *our Autthor* hath acquitted himſelf in razing this Foundation, as he calls it, of Infant-Baptiſm. For the firſt, and thus we conſtantly affirm, that the Scriptures are only and alone in a proper ſence the ground and foundation of our Faith and Practice in matters relating to the Worſhip of God; the whole

Faith

faith and practice of the Church as such ought to be resolved into, and grounded upon the Scriptures; * and consequently the only proper ground upon which this practice in special hath been, and is founded by all Orthodox and sound Divines are the Scriptures: And answerably we take in Tradition (by which we understand no more than the discoveries that have been made in and by the Church, whether doctrinally or practically of the descent of this practice from the times of Christ and his Apostles to our dayes) as a subordinate means, whereby we come to know, and are more fully confirmed that it was indeed established by Christ and his Apostles, and contained in the Doctrine of the Gospel. Neither do we say that this Tradition is the principal means whereby we come to know this: But the principal means are, the Scriptures themselves, as compared one with another; this is only a subordinate means; so that the practice we plead for is founded upon Tradition, but in a very inferiour way, *viz.* as that is a subordinate means whereby we come to know, and be more fully assured that it is according to the will of Christ reveiled in his word. But

* *Sunt Scriptura prima veritas revelata, sicut Deus est prima veritas revelans.*

Secondly, let us see whether *our Author* hath rendred this ground wholly disserviceable, as to the use we make of it; whether he hath sufficiently proved that all traditional Testimonies (as he speaks) produced by us for the establishment of the practice under debate, be indeed fabulous and fictitious, as he pretends: And here I shall

only ſingle out the teſtimony that the Epiſtle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus* gives, as to the practice of Infant-Baptiſm in his days, and ſee whether it may not be as much regarded and leaned to after he hath ſaid the utmoſt he can, as it might before; yea whether it might not before, and conſequently ſtill be greatly regarded, and ſafely leaned upon, ſo far as humane Authority may be leaned upon. And as previous hereunto, it muſt be obſerved how ſubtilly *our Author* endeavours to conceale the main, yea in effect the whole of the Evidence given in by that Epiſtle for our aſſurance, that Infant-Baptiſm was then the univerſal practice of the Church. This appears thus.

Whereas one *Fidus* a Miniſter having written to *Cyprian* to give him his judgment, whether the eighth day was not alike to be obſerved by Chriſtians as the time for the Application of Baptiſm to Infants, as it was of old for the Application of Circumciſion? *Cyprian* aſſembleth 66 Biſhops to debate that Queſtion: They all unanimouſly agree, that no ſuch obſervation ought to be made, but that Infants might lawfully be baptized, *mox poſtquam editi, immediately after they were born:* Hereupon *Cyprian* writes back to *Fidus*, giving him an account of his own and their Judgments in that particular. Now from hence we infer three things.

Firſt, that Infant-Baptiſm was then generally practiſed.

Secondly, that it had been ſo time out of mind.

Thirdly, that in as much as they lived ſo near the

the Apoſtles days, it muſt moſt probably be the practice of their times. And that which we ground theſe inferences upon is this, *viz.* That neither *Fidus*, nor *Cyprian*, and thoſe 66 Biſhops with him, did at all queſtion the lawfulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm; the former only queſtioning, the later only determining about the preciſe time of its application.

Now it ſeems altogether irrational to imagine, that ſo many on the one hand, and on the other ſhould not rather queſtion the practice it ſelf, than the time of its adminiſtration, in caſe it had not been the general practice of thoſe, yea of the Apoſtles times; ſeeing they cannot be rationally ſuppoſed, unacquainted with what was the practice of the Church even in their days. *Cyprian*, and conſequently thoſe other Biſhops contemporary with him, flouriſhed about the year 240, or 250. and conſequently about eighty years after the death of *Policarp*, who was one of the Apoſtle *John*'s Hearers and Diſciples, for he was martyred in the fourth Perſecution under *Decius* the Emperor, which was in the year 168.

Now can it be imagined that ſo many Biſhops could poſſibly be ignorant of what was the practice of the Church in the Apoſtles days, ſo nigh unto which they lived; or can it be imagined, that had they known Infants were not baptized in their days, there ſhould only ariſe a doubt among them about the time of its application, and none about the practice it ſelf. But theſe things *our Author* thought meet to conceale, and carry on his Diſcourſe, as though the ſcruple

had been about the practice it self. And from what hath been said it evidently appears, that the only question relating to this Epistle of *Cyprian* is this, *viz.* Whether this Epistle were indeed written by *Cyprian* or no? whether *Fidus* did write to him for satisfaction in that case? And whether he wrote back to him that Epistle wherein he declares his own, and those Sixty six Bishops judgements about the question proposed to *Fidus*? And hence *our Authors* first consideration to enervate this testimony of *Cyprian* signifies nothing at all; inasmuch as *Cyprian* medleth not at all with the practice it self, but takes the lawfulness of that for granted, as having been the universal practice of the Church in and since the Apostles days, and only determines the time when Baptism may be applyed to Infants.

As for his second Consideration, which alone is of any weight, *viz. that there is good ground as he saith to question whether this was* Cyprian's *and these Sixty six Bishops conclusion*, we shall easily discover the vanity of it. Let us therefore see the grounds he hath to question that.

First, His first Ground is, *because we meet with no such Council, nor doth it appear where it was held.*

To which I would say three things.

First, that the Ancients did generally, yea universally for ought it appears to the contrary, own and acknowledge this to be *Cyprians* Epistle, and consequently that there was such a Council held,

held, though the place where is not expreſt. This appears by their frequent citing of it, and for us who live ſo many hundred years after them, to call it into queſtion upon this ground, when they did not, is irrational.

Secondly, That there was ſuch a Council or Synod (for it is expreſt ſometimes by the one term, ſometimes by the other) and that it was held in *Africa*, (though the particular town or place where be not expreſt,) is expreſly declared by the *Magdeburgenſes*, Century the third, *Chap. 9. pag.* 205.

Thirdly, Some affirm it was held at *Carthage.*

His ſecond Ground is, *becauſe the grounds upon which the Concluſion is grounded are ſo weak.*

Anſw. All the Grounds are not ſo weak and frivolous as our Author pretends; but how weak ſoever, yet not more weak than *Tertullian*'s, by which he perſwades to the deferring of Baptiſm, and yet theſe are lookt upon by *our Author* as conſiderable; and whoſo is acquainted with the Fathers, will find ſomewhat of weakneſs in the reaſonings of the moſt noted among them.

Thirdly, His third Ground is, *becauſe it is a doctrine ſo much contradicted by his great Maſter* Tertullian, *whom he ſo much reverenced.*

Anſw. Tertullian doth not abſolutely oppoſe

Infant-baptiſm, only adviſeth to deferr it as more profitable: Hence this doctrine doth not abſolutely contradict *Tertullian*; but ſuppoſe it did, 'tis no wonder though *Cyprian* contradict *Tertullian* in that wherein he diſſented from the judgement and practice of the univerſal Church.

Fourthly, His laſt Ground is this, *becauſe other things have been Father'd upon him which were none of his.* This is ſo far from being a ground to queſtion whether this Epiſtle was *Cyprian*'s or no, that it doth ſtrongly argue it was his: Inaſmuch as in caſe it had not been his, it would have been ſomewhere diſcovered as thoſe other things Father'd upon him are. From all which we ſee how little ground *our Author* hath, or any others have to queſtion the truth and genuineſs of this Epiſtle; and ſuppoſing the truth and genuineſs of it; it is paſt all rational doubt that Infant-baptiſm was the known and approved practice of the primitive times. And I am bold to ſay, and doubt not but to make it good, if needful; that this one Epiſtle of *Cyprian*, gives greater evidence that Infant-baptiſm was practiſed in the primitive times, than all the Authorities *our Author* hath produced give againſt it. So that this firſt Ground (as he calls it) of Infant-baptiſm lies firm, and is as ſerviceable to the uſe we put it to, as ever it was, notwithſtanding he hath wearied, yea I may ſay wounded and bruiſed himſelf ſo much in his attempts to raze or remove it. But

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

A Vindication of the Scripture-grounds of Infant-baptiſm entred upon. Two Things remarked with reference to the Oppoſition made againſt the Argument drawn from their Federal Holineſs: The Arguments drawn from the Covenant conſidered. Three of the principal with reference to that Covenant propoſed. The unſoundneſs of Mr. Danvers *Reſolutions of them evidenced: The true Reſolutions of them given.*

SEcondly, to proceed to the other ground, *viz.* Scripture Authority, upon which Infant-baptiſm is founded, and this is that we are principally concern'd in. Suppoſe he hath (which yet he is far ſhort of) rendred the ground of Tradition utterly unſerviceable, and of no uſe to us; yet if the ground of Scripture Authority lie firm, the practice we have founded thereupon ſtands ſure. But here again I ſhall not ſpend time in the vindication of all thoſe Scriptures that *our Author* hath thought meet to beſtow his pains in rendring uſeleſs unto us. He hath it ſeems judged it highly conducing to the furtherance of his cauſe to attack where he foreſaw his conqueſt ſure; though he could not but know

that (excepting in the judgment of ſuch who conceit the cauſe is gained when a Scripture is baffled, that however made uſe of by ſome, yet really is impertinent to the queſtion in controverſie) neither our cauſe is prejudiced, nor his promoted thereby. I ſhall only remark one or two things with reference to the oppoſition he makes againſt that argument Pedobaptiſts make uſe of, drawn from the federal holineſs of the ſeed of believing Parents, grounded upon 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. for the eſtabliſhing the practice of Infant-baptiſm, and come to what I principally intend.

Firſt, It may be obſerved, of how little advantage to *our Authors* cauſe, that weighty obſervation is (for ſo I ſuppoſe he conceives it to be) that he hath made, or rather taken up from Mr. *Tombes*, concerning the antiquity of this argument. His words are theſe, ſpeaking of this argument, *of which* Zuinglius *about one hundred and twenty Years ſince, for as much as I can learn, was the firſt founder, wherein he was ſingular from all that went before him.* With reference unto which let theſe few things be obſerved.

I. That it may be ſhrewdly ſuſpected that he groſly belies his own knowledge, denyes himſelf to be able *to learn* what he cannot, (ſuppoſing him as well read in Authors as he pretends) but know. For

I. Mr. *Marſhal* (whom doubtleſs he hath read) in his anſwer to Mr. *Tombes*, ſhews him that the Ancients were not wholly ſtrangers to the federal holyneſs of the Infant-ſeed of Believers, and inſtanceth in *Athanaſius* and *Tertullian*, the one a Greek, and the other a Latine Author; and *Gerard*,

Gerard Tom. 4. *Pag.* 593. inſtanceth in two more, *viz. Auſtin* and *Jerome*, interpreting this very text to the ſame ſence, though it ſhall be granted that *Auſtin* in one of his Epiſtles was of another mind. But

2. Our Author himſelf elſewhere grants, (as is before obſerved) that that Text in *Matth.* 19. *ver.* 14. was ſo commonly urged for Infant-baptiſm, that it bore the title of the Scripture-canon for that practice; and he cannot but know that Circumciſion was frequently urged for the eſtabliſhment of the ſame practice. And can *our Author* or any one elſe imagine that learned men, having ſo great acquaintance with the Scriptures as they had, ſhould affirm Infants to belong to the kingdom of heaven, and yet know nothing of their Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, by vertue of which they can only belong thereunto. Or can any think that they underſtood not, that Circumciſion was a token of the Covenant, and anſwerably was applied to Infants as ſuch? It is plain they did: *Auſtin* in his Fourth Book concerning Baptiſm, *Chap.* 24. determines that the Sacrament of Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith to *Iſaac*, even in his infancy when he was but eight days old. So *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophilact* cited by *our Author* himſelf, affirmed it with the Apoſtle, to be a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith; which righteouſneſs is undoubtedly one of the bleſſings promiſed in the Covenant of Grace. And hence it cannot be rationally ſuppoſed, but that they muſt apply Baptiſm to Infants under the ſame notion under which Circumciſion was applied to them of old.

Would

Would they plead for Baptiſm from Circumciſion, unleſs they took it for granted that Infants ſtill had the ſame ground for Baptiſm, *viz.* intereſt in the Covenant, that the Infant-ſeed of the Jews had for Circumciſion. Now the federal holineſs of Infants that we plead for, and make one ground of their Baptiſm is the ſame thing expreſt in other words with their Covenant intereſt, or ſtate, at leaſt is the immediate reſult of it. But

2. Can it be any advantage to his, or prejudice to our cauſe that ſome arguments have been found out of late, beyond what have been formerly made uſe of. I ſuppoſe *our Author* will not think the cauſe he pleads for is prejudiced by any thing he hath brought to light, *de novo.*

3. That it is the ſtrength of Arguments, not the Antiquity or Authors of them; that the cauſe is concern'd in: Hence if this be a valid Argument, it matters not who was the firſt Author of it. But

2. I muſt remark his confident aſſertion, *pag.* 198. where ſaith he, ſpeaking ſtill of this Argument, *we have two things aſſerted, but not at all proved:* What thoſe things are he tells us.

Firſt, That the holyneſs in the text is meant of federal holyneſs.

Secondly, That federal holyneſs qualifies for Baptiſm.

Neither of theſe, ſaith he, *is at all proved.* Had he ſaid not ſufficiently or ſatisfactorily proved, it had argued ſome modeſty; but, not at all proved, is too high for one no better skill'd in Argumentation, than for what appears in his Book he is.

Whether

Whether what *our Author* hath ſaid, be of more force to diſprove, than what others, eſpecially Mr. *Baxter* hath ſaid to prove, that this ſame federal holineſs is intended in the text, I ſhall refer to the judgement of all unbyaſſed and unprejudiced men; and come to what I more eſpecially aim at, and that is to vindicate thoſe Arguments drawn from the Covenant as eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their Generations, for the confirmation of the practice we plead for, from the attempts *our Author* hath made to invalidate them.

And that the Reader may more clearly ſee how we infer and conclude Infant-baptiſm from the Covenant as ſo eſtabliſhed, he muſt carefully obſerve and remember four things.

Firſt, That we diſtinguiſh between the Covenant-intereſt, or (as it is uſually call'd) federal holyneſs of the Infant-ſeed of Believers, and their right to Baptiſm.

Secondly, That it is their Covenant-intereſt that we principally contend for, and deſign the proof of, from the Covenant at firſt eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* the Father of the faithful.

Thirdly, That we plead not for Infant-baptiſm merely from the Analogy it bears with or to Circumciſion, as though the Analogy between them were a ſufficient ground of the application of Baptiſm to Infants, as *our Author* would bear men in hand that we do.

Fourthly, Though we judge it a very rational ſuppoſal, that the application of the token of the Covenant ſhould be as extenſive under the New Teſtament, as it was under the old: Yet do we not

not ground our practice merely upon that ſuppoſal, but upon the command obliging *Abrahams* ſeed in their Generations to keep the Covenant, that is the token of the Covenant. And hence we ſay that Infant-baptiſm may be ſufficiently proved from the Covenant ſo far as we deſign the proof of it therefrom, as made with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their Generations; though little conſideration be had of Circumciſion. Whence it is but a ſubtil inſinuation to prejudicate the minds of unwary Readers to talk of our Arguments from Circumciſion; it is not from Circumciſion, but from the Covenant that we plead for Infant-baptiſm. Hence the Reſolution of theſe four queſtions is neceſſary and ſufficient for the diſcovering whether Infant-baptiſm may, or may not be truly inferred and concluded from the Covenant as now eſtabliſh'd with *Abraham*.

Firſt, Whether the New or Goſpel Covenant, and this mentioned *Gen.* 17. be one and the ſame? Or more plainly, whether the New Covenant, the Covenant under the New Teſtament adminiſtration, under which Believers are; be not the ſame with that mentioned *Gen.* 17.7?

Secondly, Whether the Infants of *Abraham* and his ſeed, and that as ſuch were not included and comprehended in this Covenant, and that both in the promiſſory and preceptive part of it?

Thirdly, Whether Circumciſion was the token, ſign, or ſeal of the Covenant both to Parents and Children?

Fourthly, Whether Baptiſm be not the token, ſign, or ſeal of the Covenant under the Goſpel adminiſtration?

The

The ſatisfactory reſolution of theſe queſtions would be ſufficient for the diſcovery of the mind and will of God relating unto Baptiſm, ſo far as it is held forth unto us in the Covenant, as at firſt eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their Generations. For if ſo be it be indeed certain, that the Covenant believers are now under, be the ſame with that eſtabliſh'd with *Abraham*, and the Infants both of *Abraham* and his ſeed, and that as ſuch; were included and comprehended in the Covenant, both in the promiſſory and preceptive part of it: and conſequently as the promiſe ſo the command concerning the application and bearing of the token of the Covenant did tend to and concern them: And that Circumciſion was the ſign, token, or ſeal of the Covenant both to Parents and Children, and Baptiſm doth now ſucceed in the place, room, and uſe of Circumciſion in that general notion and conſideration, as a ſign or token of the Covenant; then paſt all rational doubt, according to the true intendment of God in this Covenant, Infants ought to be baptized, as of old they were circumciſed. But if theſe or any of theſe things be not ſo, but are mere miſtakes on our part, I ſhall confeſs, we have no ſure footing for the practice of Infant-baptiſm in the Covenant, as at firſt eſtabliſh'd with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their Generations. But ſeeing *our Author* hath judged it more conducing to his cauſe to tread in a different path, I muſt follow him in that, and ſee what he hath gained by his ſo doing; with this proviſo, that I ſhall more lightly touch upon theſe queſtions wherein the practice in controverſie is leſs; and more enlarge

large upon thoſe wherein it is more neerly concerned. His

Firſt Particular or Enquiry is, *whether Circumciſion call'd the Goſpel Seal, did of old belong to all in Goſpel Covenant.* This he reſolves in the Negative, and gives us two reaſons of that his reſolution.

Firſt, *Becauſe ſome that were in the Goſpel Covenant were not ſealed.*

Secondly, *Becauſe ſome that were out of the Covenant were ſealed therewith.*

Anſw. This queſtion but little (if at all) concerns the main queſtion in controverſie; ſo that ſhould his reſolution prove right, we are not hurt thereby: And the reaſon is evident, *viz.* becauſe we ground Infant-baptiſm upon their Covenant-intereſt, ariſing from their relation to ſuch Parents who are to be accounted *Abraham*'s ſeed, conſidered in conjunction with the command obliging all his ſeed in their Generations, *(i. e.)* both they and their Children to keep the Covenant, *(i e)* the token of the Covenant. Hence unleſs *our Author* prove, (which he attempts not) that Circumciſion did not belong to all *Abraham*'s ſeed in their Generations, including, as before, Parents and their Infants, and conſequently that there were ſome Infants, who though the Children of ſuch Parents as were to be accounted *Abraham*'s ſeed, yet neither had any intereſt in the Covenant, nor were to be circumciſed.

His inſtances of perſons in Covenant who were not circumciſed, and of perſons out of Covenant who were circumciſed, (ſuppoſing it were ſo as he ſaith) ſignifie nothing to his purpoſe. Let

God

God diſpoſe of his own inſtitutions as himſelf pleaſeth. Let us mind our own duties: Now this is evident, that as *Abraham*'s ſeed in their generations are under the promiſe that God will be a God unto them; ſo they are under the command that they in their generations do keep the Covenant *(i e)* the token of the Covenant. Let *our Author* either prove that Infants were not included with their Parents either in the promiſes, or in the command concerning the application of the token of the Covenant, or elſe that Circumciſion ought not to be applyed to all included in the Covenant, otherwiſe he ſaith nothing to purpoſe. Therefore

Secondly, Whether the New or Goſpel Covenant and that mention'd *Gen.* 17. be one and the ſame ?

Anſw. In reſolving this queſtion *our Author* ſpeaks warily and indeed gives no reſolution at all, but leaves his Reader in the dark. I ſuppoſe he knew that to have abſolutely denyed, that the Covenant here mention'd is one and the ſame with the New Covenant under which Believers now are, had involved him in inextricable difficulties; and yet to have affirmed that they are one and the ſame, had given a ſhrewd blow to his cauſe Hence he judgeth it meet, only to caſt a miſt before his Readers eyes by needleſs and impertinent diſtinctions about a double capacity that *Abraham* ſtood in, and two different ſorts of promiſes made to him. But how thoſe diſtinctions conduce any thing to ſatisfie the Reader about the queſtion put, he declares not. So that the Reader muſt needs remain at the ſame uncer-

tainty

tainty, whether that Covenant, and the New Covenant be one and the ſame, or whether they are two diſtinct Covenants, that he was at before. It is true he inſtanceth in ſeveral promiſes, and among the reſt, one in the fifth Verſe of this Chapter, which is made perſonally to *Abraham*, and wherein none of his Seed have any part with him; and pretends to mention another, that he ſaith, *in an eſpecial manner belongs* (a dark and doubtful expreſſion) *to the New Covenant*. I ſay pretends, becauſe it is uncertain, whether there be not a miſtake in the Printer, putting the eighth Verſe for the ſeventh; though I very much ſuſpect there is not, and if not ſo, he wholly paſſeth by the Covenant, or that promiſe in the ſeventh Verſe, about which the main and proper queſtion between our oppoſers and us is mainly (if not only) concerned. Seeing there is no ſuch promiſe as he mentions in that Verſe he points to, it can be but a pretence meerly to blind the eyes of his Reader, and lead him blindfold through this Queſtion; the right determination of which is of ſuch vaſt importance for the clearing up the main Queſtion in controverſie between us.

To the next queſtion, which he judged he could give a more plauſible anſwer to, without expoſing himſelf to any ſuch inconveniencies as a plain down-right Anſwer to this would have done; and if there be a miſtake, the eighth Verſe being put for the ſeventh, then we have the full of what we deſire: But ſeeing *our Author* hath thought it convenient thus to divert from the queſtion, himſelf propoſed, I would

would desire him, (if ever he write again) plainly and distinctly to resolve these two or three questions, absolutely necessary for the unfolding this dark and confused Discourse, that he pretends as a full resolution of this question.

First, whether this Covenant mentioned in the seventeenth of *Genesis*, were made with *Abraham* as a Natural, or as a Spiritual Father, or considered in both these capacities? We say as considered in both; upon what ground he may see in my Infant-Baptism from Heaven, *Page* the seventh and eighth.

Secondly, to what Covenant these promises that he mentions as made to *Abraham* as a Natural Father, with respect to his Natural Seed, did belong? Did they belong to the Covenant of Works, or (as some call it) the Covenant of Nature? or was there any other Covenant afore made with *Abraham*, unto which they did belong? or did they belong to no Covenant at all? We say they belonged to the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant, though some of them at least were indefinite promises made to his Seed in general; not definite, made to any individuals of his Seed; or (as others express it) they were promises, not of the essence of, only appendices to the Covenant. And the reason is, because we judge them to be Covenant-Mercies, and can find no other Covenant they can with any shew of reason be supposed to appertain unto. If *our Author* will help us out here, he shall have hearty thanks for his pains.

Thirdly, whether it was a mistake of the Printer, in putting down the eighth Verse for

the ſeventh, or no? If it was not, (as I ſuppoſe he will be unwilling (for reaſons he knows) to grant, that this promiſe in the ſeventh Verſe doth belong to the New Covenant, or Covenant of Grace, under which Believers are, under the New Teſtament) I would ask him, or any other man that is *Compos mentis*, whether the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* in the former part of the eight Verſe, and the promiſe of God's being their God in the latter part of the ſame Verſe, were not made to the ſame perſons? Let the words be but read. *And I will give unto thee, and unto thy Seed after thee the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of* Canaan, *for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, and I will be their God.* Now ask but any Child that hath learned his Accidence; what is the Antecedent to, *their?* Surely he will preſently reply, *thy Seed*, mentioned in the former part of the Verſe, unto whom the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* is made.

Now then theſe two promiſes as thus connected and made joyntly to the ſame perſons, they muſt needs belong to one and the ſame Covenant; which being granted, as infallibly it will by all that have any regard to what they ſay; I would ask any man, whether they do think they belong to the Covenant mentioned Verſe the ſeventh or no? Did I think it were neceſſary, I ſhould add ſomething to prove that they do.

Now then let things be laid together, and ſeriouſly weighed: That the promiſe of God's being a God to *Abraham*'s Seed mentioned in the eighth Verſe

Verſe belongs to the Covenant of Grace, is poſitively aſſerted by *our Author*. That the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan*, and this promiſe were made to the ſame Seed is undeniable, and that both theſe promiſes belong to one and the ſame Covenant is as undeniable as the former. And yet further, that the Covenant they belong to is that mentioned Verſe the ſeventh, is as much above any rational queſtion as either. Now he acknowledgeth, that the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* was made to *Abraham* with reſpect to his Natural Seed; and from all it will appear, even from what *our Author* himſelf acknowledgeth, as though written with the Beams of the Sun, that the Covenant mentioned *Geneſis* the ſeventeenth, and the ſeventh, is the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant; the ſame with that Believers are now under, and that this Covenant was made with *Abraham* as a Natural, as well as a Spiritual Father, with reſpect to his Natural as well as his Spiritual Seed; and ſo we have both this and the next queſtion anſwered together. And yet further, that the Covenant mentioned Verſe the ſeventh, eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, is not only a Covenant of Grace; but the Covenant of Grace, under which Believers in New Teſtament times are, is ſufficiently made out elſewhere; and indeed is ſo evident from that Diſcourſe of the Apoſtle in the third to the *Galatians*, that it is to admiration how any man can pretend to own the Writings of the Apoſtles, and yet queſtion it. That he hath refe-

Infant-Baptiſm from Heaven, Page 191, 192.

rence, Verſe the ſixteenth, to this Covenant is paſt all doubt, in as much as there is no other promiſe expreſt in theſe terms, *to thy Seed*, (wherein the very ſtrength of the Apoſtles Argument lies) but only this: And that the Covenant in which that promiſe is contained was never diſanulled; but is that Covenant according to which Believers enjoy all the bleſſings of the Goſpel, is as evident as any thing in the World can be made by words, as is ſufficiently ſhewed in the forementioned Diſcourſe. So that I need add no more; only I ſhall ſay that the promiſe, *Geneſis* the ſeventeenth, ſeventh Verſe, doth not only belong to the Covenant of Grace under which Believers ſtill are, but is the very ſum and ſubſtance of it, as to God's part; and our oppoſers ſhutting their eyes againſt the Scripture-Light evidencing the Truth hereof, is one ſpecial cauſe of their falling into, and continuing in that Errour they ſo pertinaciouſly maintain.

Queſt. 3. But to proceed; *What Seed of* Abraham *it is to whom that promiſe* (*Geneſis* ſeventeenth, ſeventh Verſe) *doth belong, whether his Natural, or his Spiritual Seed? Our Author* adds another Queſtion, *viz. Who thoſe Children of promiſe mentioned in the ſecond of Acts the thirty ninth Verſe are?* which at preſent I ſhall not concern my ſelf about. Let one Queſtion be anſwered firſt: And though *our Author* do not expreſly declare his Sentiments at firſt, yet after he doth, and is very peremtory and poſitive (upon what grounds will preſently appear) that that promiſe did not at all, or in any ſence belong to *Abraham*'s Natural, but wholly and alone

alone to his ſpiritual ſeed. And he conceives the Scriptures themſelves give us ſuch a full and plain expoſition of this promiſe, as might ſeem to be enough to determine the queſtion, without any more ado: What is the good contained in this promiſe, I ſhall (if the Lord will) open hereafter, that which we are at preſent to enquire into is, whether this promiſe did not belong to *Abraham*'s natural ſeed, and that merely as ſuch; as well as to his ſpiritual ſeed? And thus in a direct oppoſition to what *our Author* hath affirmed, I ſhall ſay, That this promiſe did belong not only to *Abrahams* ſpiritual but alſo to his natural ſeed, and that *eo nomine* as his natural ſeed: That it did not belong to all his natural ſeed in the ſame ſence; or after the ſame manner I freely grant: For take the promiſe as a definite promiſe, conveying and making over an actual right and title to the good contained and intended in it to each individual and particular ſubject of it, ſo it did belong only to *Abrahams* natural ſeed immedidiately proceeding from his own loyns, (as *Iſhmael*, *Iſaac* &c.) and it did belong univerſally to them, or to them one as well as another. But take it as an indefinite promiſe, ſignifying to and aſſuring *Abraham* and his ſeed of the will and purpoſe of God to beſtow the good, contained and intended in it, upon them in a more ſpecial and peculiar manner, ſo it did belong to his natural ſeed proceeding mediately from him in all ſucceeding ages; and conſequently in this ſence it doth belong to the Jews as the ſeed of *Abraham* above what it doth to the race or poſterity of any men whatſoever to this very day; in

which regard they are *Rom.* 11. 16. *ſaid to be holy.* We are only at preſent concern'd in the former way and manner of its belonging to the natural ſeed of *Abraham*; and that this promiſe as thus conſidered, did belong to all *Abrahams* natural ſeed immediately proceeding from his own loyns hath been (I conceive) ſo evidently and unanſwerably proved elſewhere, that unleſs thoſe arguments could be anſwer'd it may ſeem wholly ſuperfluous to add any thing more: And indeed the caſe lies ſo evident and plain, that it admits of no contradiction, unleſs men are reſolved to force their way over the belly (to uſe that Scotch phraſe) of the plaineſt Scriptures: Saith God, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed in their generations.* Now how was it poſſible but that *Abraham* muſt underſtand this firſtly and immediately of his natural Children. It is true, God had told him that he ſhould be *a father of many Nations*, and he might well think that thoſe nations, he ſhould be a Father to, might be included in the term *ſeed*; but to underſtand it of thoſe, excluding his natural Children would have been abſurd and irrational: And beſides God tells him that to this ſeed he promiſeth to be a God, unto them he would give the land of *Canaan* in which he was now a ſtranger. Now is it poſſible that he ſhould imagine that his natural ſeed were excluded? And yet further that which yet makes it moſt plain, is the expreſs command of God to apply the token of this very Covenant, and that under that very notion and conſideration, as the token of it, to all his natural ſeed immediately proceeding from his

Infant-baptiſm pag. 19.

own

own loyns. Theſe things lie ſo evident, that all attempts againſt them prove not only vain, but greatly reflect upon their Authors.

Let us then ſee the Scriptures *our Author* produceth expounding (as he ſaith) this promiſe, and (as he conceits) ſo fully confirming the ſeed here mention'd, to whom the promiſe belong'd, not to be *Abraham*'s carnal (he ſhould have ſaid natural) but his ſpiritual ſeed. And thus he gives us three texts of Scripture; but of how little uſe as to his purpoſe will immediately appear. His firſt Scripture is, *Gal.* 3. 16. where ſaith the Apoſtle, *now to Abraham and his ſeed were the promiſes made; he ſaith, not to ſeeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy ſeed which is Chriſt.* So that the promiſes were made to Chriſt, and *our Author* thinks it will infallibly follow, that they were not made to his natural ſeed. But how he inferrs this he tells us not: That by Chriſt here we are to underſtand Chriſt myſtical, that is the Church, including Chriſt himſelf as the head: I ſuppoſe he hath more underſtanding than to deny. Now we affirm, that *Abraham*'s natural ſeed, as ſuch, did, as being under the promiſe, belong to the viſible body or Church of Chriſt, as then gather'd in or conſtituted of his Family. So that the children of Believers and that as ſuch during their Infant ſtate; belong to the ſame myſtical body of Chriſt, as upheld and continued yet in the world: Yea we lay this their relation to the Church as one ground of our application of Baptiſm to them. Now what a vain and frivolous thing is it to imagine, that the Apoſtles affirming that the promiſe is only made to Chriſt

ſhould expound it as excluding Infants from any intereſt in it, when we do conſtantly affirm Infants to appertain unto Chriſt, to whom the promiſe is made. But I am much perſwaded, that *our Author* never intended his book for the ſatisfaction or conviction of any that either had any conſiderable ſtock of reaſon, or would make uſe of what they had, but he wrote it for the uſe of another ſort of people. To as little purpoſe is his citation of the 29 verſ. of the ſame Chapter, *If you be Chriſts, then are you Abrahams ſeed*; Εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ. If ye be of Chriſt or appertain unto Chriſt as members of his myſtical Body, then are ye *Abrahams* ſeed. And we ſay (and *our Author* hath not proved the contrary) that the Infant-ſeed of Believers are of, and do appertain to Chriſt.

As for his ſecond Scripture, *viz. Rom.* 9. 7. 8. that is ſo far from expounding the promiſe in favour of his ſence, that it doth neceſſarily imply the direct contrary, as hath been made to appear elſewhere: The Apoſtle doth plainly imply, that there were ſome who were *Abrahams* ſeed, and as ſuch were the ſubjects of the promiſe who were not the Children of God in the ſence there intended by the Apoſtle, ſuch was *Iſhmael* as he ſhews in the following words: But ſee this text fully opened and vindicated in the forementioned treatiſe.

Infant-baptiſm Chap. 7. Pag. 128.

For his third Scripture, namely *Rom.* 4. 13. 14. how that ſhould expound the promiſe in favour of *our Authors* ſence is hard to imagine, but to ſome the bare mention of a Scripture is full proof,

proof, how little ſoever it make to the purpoſe. How far and in what ſence the Infant-ſeed of Believers as received into the ſame Covenant with their Parents; are intereſted in or made partakers of the righteouſneſs of faith may be enquired into hereafter: let it at preſent be only obſerved that both *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were joynt-heirs with *Abraham* of the ſame promiſe during *Abrahams* life time. Hence it is ſaid, *Heb.* 11 9. *By faith he ſojourned in the land of promiſe as in a ſtrange Country, dwelling in Tabernacles with* Iſaac *and* Jacob *the heirs with him of the ſame promiſe.* Now *Jacob* at *Abrahams* death was but fifteen years old, and the Apoſtle ſpeaks of his living with them for ſome time before his death in Tabernacles, as being then coheirs with him of the ſame promiſe. Now ſaith the Apoſtle in this text, both *Abraham* and his ſeed, among which ſeed we muſt neceſſarily include *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, both he and they were heirs through the righteouſneſs of faith. Whence it is plain that *Jacob* (and the ſame is true of *Iſaac*) in his Infant ſtate was an heir of the World, (as the Apoſtle here ſpeaks) through the righteouſneſs of faith, when he had not a perſonal faith himſelf; but as the Child of a Covenant-Parent. Whence it appears, that the Infant-ſeed of Believers may be heirs of the promiſes through the righteouſneſs of faith, though themſelves not perſonally believing.

Now then let all men judge, whether theſe Scriptures do ſo fully confirm as *our Author* pretends, yea or do give any rational or probable intimation, that not *Abrahams* natural, but only his ſpiritual ſeed were intended in that promiſe:

As

As for the *diſmal conſequences* (as he calls them) ſuppoſed to ariſe from what we affirm, they are meer Chimeraes feigned by *our Author*, through his darkneſs, partly about the true and proper good contained in, and conveyed by the Covenant as extended to the Infant-ſeed of believers, and partly about the true tenour of the Covenant as made with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their generations: Of the former I ſhall (if the Lord will) ſpeak more fully hereafter: Of the latter I have ſpoken ſufficiently elſewhere, and ſhall touch again when I come to ſpeak to his fift enquiry. Now then theſe two laſt enquiries being rightly determined, a good foundation is in a conſiderable meaſure laid for the practice of Infant-baptiſm. For if the Covenant eſtabliſh'd with *Abraham* be the very ſame with that Believers are ſtill under; and *Abrahams* natural ſeed as immediately proceeding from his own loyns were taken in as joynt ſubjects with him of the ſame Covenant and promiſes, both which things are evidently true: It is very rational to ſuppoſe that all his ſeed (among whom Believers are undoubtedly to be reckon'd) ſhould (as it is certain they do) partake in the ſame priviledge: And the Infants of Believers being joynt-ſubjects with their Parents of the Covenant, it is very rational to conclude that they ſhould have the preſent token applyed to them; as the Infant-ſeed of Covenant Parents had the former token of the Covenant applyed unto them, of which more anon. And I cannot (before I proceed any farther) but remark the care of God over, and his goodneſs

Infant-baptiſm from Heaven from pag 49 to 64.

to

to his Church, that he ſhould ſo fully acquaint us with, as the nature, ſo the true tenour of the Covenant, at the firſt eſtabliſhment of it with the Father of the faithful; that ſo if any doubt ſhould after ariſe, they might have recourſe to the firſt eſtabliſhment, and from thence receive ſatisfaction. And no wonder though his will relating to the Infant-ſeed of his people ſhould be more ſparingly ſpoken to afterwards, when it is ſo fully and plainly reveiled at the firſt entrance into Covenant with *Abraham*, and the faithful as his ſeed.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. Danvers *his Four laſt Grounds reſpecting the Covenant conſidered: The unſoundneſs of his Reſolutions of them ſhewed: The true Reſolutions of them given and proved: The Argument drawn from the Covenant how ſtrengthned thereby, ſhewed.*

THe next thing enquired into is, *Whether Circumciſion was a ſeal of the New Covenant to Believers and their ſeed?*

Anſw. The Terms and Phraſes *our Author* hath ſeen meet to uſe, his varying of them, together with his uncouth and unſcriptural expreſſions and impertinencies plainly ſhew for whoſe ſake he wrote. But ſuch things ſignifie nothing to thoſe

thoſe *who* as *Elihu* ſpeaks, *have ears to try words as well as mouths to taſt meat.* That which he is to enquire after, (if his enquiry be any thing to purpoſe) is, *Whether Circumciſion were a ſeal of the Covenant of Grace as entred with* Abraham *and his ſeed in their Generations, to the people of God and their Children or Infant-ſeed.* This he ſeems to be very far from yielding, for he firſt denyes it to be ſo much as a ſeal to them, and Secondly, which muſt needs follow, he much more denyes it to be a ſeal of the New Covenant, that is the Covenant of Grace, and gives ſome kind of reaſons, ſuch as they are, for thoſe his denyals.

Infant-baptiſm from Heaven pag. 231 to 237.

But having elſewhere proved by ſeveral (pardon me though I ſay) I hope irrefragable Arguments, that Circumciſion was a ſeal to all thoſe who were the due ſubjects of it (and when I prove it to be a ſeal, I mean it was ſo of the Covenant of Grace) I ſhall not need to ſay much more, freely appealing to all men of a competent underſtanding, and not greatly foreſtalled in their judgments? Whether *our Authors* Reaſons do out-weigh thoſe Arguments? I ſhall therefore briefly conſider his Reaſons and quickly diſmiſs the queſtion.

That Circumciſion was a ſeal to *Abraham, our Author* cannot deny, but he conceives it was a ſeal only to him, and to no body elſe. The proof of this his conceit he ſeems to eſſay two ways, Firſt by Reaſon, Secondly by humane Authority, his reaſons ſeem to be theſe two.

Firſt, *The thing that it was a ſeal, confirmation and ratification of to* Abraham *was incompatible to Infants;*

Infants; for ſo he expreſſeth himſelf, *its true, it was a ſeal, confirmation and ratification of the faith that* Abraham *had long before he was Circumciſed, but ſo could it not be ſaid of any Infant that had no faith.*

Anſw. It is a groſs miſtake to ſay that Circumciſion was a ſeal, confirmation or ratification of *Abrahams* faith; the ſcripture ſaith no ſuch thing, neither do the Authors he cites ſay any ſuch thing: They ſay according to Scripture, *it was called a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, becauſe it was given to* Abraham *as a ſeal and Teſtimony of that righteouſneſs he had acquired by faith:* They do not ſay as *our Author*, that it was a ſeal, confirmation or ratification of the Faith which *Abraham* had before he was circumciſed, but of the righteouſneſs of faith. Now that Infants are capable of the righteouſneſs of faith, though they cannot act faith themſelves; is evident from that inſtance of *Jacob* before mentioned, and I ſuppoſe *our Author* himſelf will not upon ſecond thoughts deny it: For I would ask him whether he thinks any Infants are either any way concerned in *Adams* ſin, or have any pollution or corruption of nature inherent in themſelves? In a word, whether there be any ſuch thing as Original ſin, either *Originans* or *Originatum*? if there be, how come any Infants that dye in their Infancy freed from it, do they carry the guilt under which they came into the world into Heaven, or are they univerſally thrown into Hell? Certainly if any of them be ſaved, it muſt be through the righteouſneſs of faith, that is, Gods non-imputation of the guilt to them; and his acceptation of them there-

thereupon as righteous through Chriſt. Now if they are capable of the righteouſneſs of faith, let him ſhew any Scripture or Reaſon, why they might not have that righteouſneſs ſealed and confirmed to them by an outward and viſible ſign. So this firſt Reaſon is a mere trifle, ſignifies nothing at all, let us ſee his other therefore.

Secondly, He argues from the ſingularity or ſpeciality of the promiſes made to *Abraham*, and thus he inſtances in four promiſes. Firſt, *that he ſhould be the Father of many Nations*. Secondly, *The father of the Faithful*. Thirdly, *The heir of the world*. Fourthly, *That in him all the Families of the earth ſhould be bleſſed*: Now he acknowledgeth that Circumciſion was a ſeal or confirmation (witneſs he calls it, but that's the thing I judge he intends) of theſe promiſes to *Abraham*, but becauſe none of his ſeed had any of theſe promiſes appertaining to them, therefore he conceives it could not be a ſeal unto them.

Anſw. Let it be obſerved, that *our Author* had in his anſwer to his ſecond queſtion, inſtanced in (at leaſt) ſome of theſe promiſes, as the promiſes that were made to *Abraham* as a ſpiritual Father, and of which he ſaith, *they in a ſpecial manner belong to the Covenant of Grace*; and here he ſaith that Circumciſion was a witneſs to, or did ſeal and confirm theſe promiſes to *Abraham*; ſo that according to *our Authors* own acknowledgment, this carnal Ordinance of Circumciſion, as our oppoſers uſually call it, might be, yea was a ſeal of the moſt ſpiritual part or promiſes of the New Covenant to *Abraham*: Yet (ſuch is the power of prejudice) he will not allow it to be a ſeal, ſo much

much as of the moſt carnal, or temporal promiſe to any of his ſeed. But ſure he will not meet with many (unleſs alike prejudiced with himſelf) but will be eaſily perſwaded, that ſeeing Circumciſion was a ſeal to *Abraham*, of the moſt ſpiritual part of the Covenant, it might (if it pleaſed God ſo to ordain it) be not only a ſeal of the temporal, but alſo of the ſpiritual part of the Covenant to any or to all of *Abrahams* ſeed; whether grown perſons or Infants, as well as it was to himſelf: And the truth is, Circumciſion was the token, ſign or ſeal of the whole Covenant, though it did ſeal and confirm the particular promiſes contained in it, to particular perſons according as they were reſpectively intereſſed in them. Hence it is called *the token of the Covenant*, without any limitation of its uſe to any particular promiſes, *it ſhall be* (ſays God ſpeaking of Circumciſion) *a token of the Covenant between me and you*, *Gen.* 17. 11. But I ſhall leave this to the Judgment of all men, yea of our oppoſers themſelves, whether *our Author* hath ſaid any thing to render it ſo much as probable, that Circumciſion was not a ſeal to any, unleſs to *Abraham* himſelf. But however, be this firſt thing true or no, yet he ſeems to be paſt all doubt, that Circumciſion could not be a ſeal of the New Covenant to Believers, and their ſeed; therefore ſays he, *much leſs was it a ſeal of the New Covenant:* This he endeavours to prove by this reaſon, (*viz.*) *becauſe nothing is the ſeal of the New Teſtament, but only the ſpirit*, for which *Epheſ.* 1. 13. *and* 4. 30. are cited.

Anſw. As it is ſomewhat difficult to gueſs at what he would ſay, ſo unleſs he purpoſely deſign-

ed

ed to beguil his Reader, it can be hardly thought himself knows what he does say: For to what purpose does he talk here of the New Testament, taking that phrase in the New Testament sence: The New Testament sure he knows took not place till the death of the Testator, when Circumcision had a period put to it: And that the spirit was promised or given to the Jews or people of God under the first Testament, to be unto them as the seal of the Covenant as then administred, is an assertion that must owe its original to Mr. *Danvers*. But to bring the Reader out of this maze of nonsensical words, I shall affirm in a direct opposition to what he affirms, that Circumcision was not only a seal to the people of God and their seed under the first Testament, but was a seal unto them of the Covenant of Grace: It was a seal unto them of that Covenant established with *Abraham* and his seed in their generations, But that was the Covenant of Grace; Therefore Circumcision was a seal unto them of the Covenant of Grace: That that Covenant was the Covenant of Grace, the same under which Believers still are; and that Circumcision was a seal of that Covenant to all those whether grown persons or Infants, who as under the Covenant had it duely applyed to them; and that Infants were under that Covenant hath been proved already: Hence the Conclusion is undenyable. I shall only add one Argument more to prove what is affirmed, (*viz.*) That Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant of Grace to all, whether Infants or grown persons, that were the due and proper subjects of it, and so dismiss this question.

Arg. When

Arg. When any Ordinance is appointed for, or applyed to ſeveral ſubjects under one and the ſame notion, look of what uſe that Ordinance is interpreted by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, to be unto any of them; of the ſame uſe it is, and ought to be ſo interpreted unto all, ſuppoſing them capable of ſuch an uſe, and God hath no where declared his will that it ſhould not be of ſuch an uſe to them for whom it is appointed, and to whom it is duly applyed. But Circumciſion was appointed for and applyed to *Abraham* and all his ſeed, whether Believers or their ſeed under one and the ſame notion; and is interpreted by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf to be of this uſe (*viz.*) a ſeal of the Covenant of Grace unto *Abraham*: Therefore it is and ought to be interpreted of that uſe to all his ſeed, whether Believers or their ſeed, who are the due and proper ſubjects of it. For the major propoſition, the truth of that is paſt all rational doubt, the denyal of it will give a ſhrewd ſtroke to the faith and comfort of all believers.

For the minor propoſition, that conſiſts of two branches, Firſt, that Circumciſion was appointed for and applyed to *Abraham* and all his ſeed under one and the ſame notion (*viz.*) as the token of the Covenant, this is the expreſs words of the text, *Gen.* 17. 11.

Secondly, That it is interpreted by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf to be unto him a ſeal of the Covenant of Grace: It is interpreted to be a ſeal of the promiſe of the Covenant of Grace, and conſequently of the Covenant conſtituted and made up of thoſe promiſes; that it was a ſeal of the promiſes of, or belonging o the Covenant of Grace,

our Author himſelf acknowledgeth, and is undenyable from that *Rom.* 4. 11. and hence our concluſion will undenyably follow. We ſee then firſt, that the Covenant eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* and his ſeed in their generations was the Covenant of Grace, the very ſame with that Believers are ſtill under. Secondly, that the promiſes of the Covenant, and conſequently the Covenant it ſelf, did belong to *Abrahams* natural ſeed immediately procceding from his own loyns, as well as to his ſpiritual: And Thirdly, that Circumciſion was the ſeal of the Covenant of Grace; that Covenant of which it was the ſeal being the Covenant of Grace: As for what *our Author* adds in the cloſe of this queſtion concerning Baptiſm, as it concerns not the preſent queſtion, ſo it is of no conſideration in it ſelf, though I may touch upon it in its proper place, yet let me ſay, as it does greatly reflect upon any to write, ſo it ſeems ſomewhat to reflect upon the underſtanding of all men, to anſwer ſuch trifles as theſe: It arguing a very low ebb of humane reaſon that any man ſhould need help to ſee the vanity of them: But to proceed,

5. The fifth thing *our Author* propoſes for his examination is, *Whether Circumciſion was adminiſtred to Believers as Believers, and to their ſeed after them as ſuch, to which Baptiſm was to correſſpond.* This *our Author* vehemently denyes, with what reaſon will ſoon appear; only as previous to the conſideration of his determination of this queſtion, and giving the true ſolution of it, I muſt a little open the true ſence and meaning of it: And thus, when it is queried, whether Circumciſion

cumcision was administred to believers as believers? the meaning must needs be (otherwise we are not at all concern'd in it,) whether Circumcision was *de jure*, according to the institution administred, or to be administred to believers, as believers? that it might be *de facto* administred to others than *de jure* it ought to be is unquestionable: How or to whom it was at any time administred, concerns not us; but how or to whom it was administred, when administred according to the mind of God in the institution. So then the question is, whether Circumcision according to the will and appointment of God, was or ought to be administred to Believers as Believers? Why *our Author* useth New Testament terms and phrases, when speaking with respect to the Old Testament times he knows best. But by believers we are to understand such as according to that administration were to be accounted and reputed the Covenant people of God, such who according to the terms then proposed, might warrantably lay claim to that promise of Gods being a God to them; what was a sure ground for such a claim we determine not, it concerns not our present purpose: Our only enquiry at present is, whether Circumcision was according to the will of God administred to the Covenant people of God, or to persons as personally accepting of, and performing the terms or conditions of the Covenant as then administred, and that as such, and to their seed as such? Or whether it was not administred to men upon some other account, as suppose their relation to *Abraham* as his natural posterity or the like, and consequently whether there be

in this particular, a correſpondency between the adminiſtration of Circumciſion and the adminiſtration of Baptiſm, ſo that this one queſtion may be branched out into three diſtinct queſtions.

I ſhall begin with the Firſt: And that is, whether Circumciſion was according to the will of God adminiſtred to believers as believers, that is, to perſons as perſonally accepting of, and performing the conditions of the Covenant of Grace, as adminiſtred under the firſt Teſtament and that as ſuch?

Our Author is ſtill on the negative part, he is very poſitive it was not, and he gives this reaſon of his perſwaſion: For, *ſays he, it was an Ordinance which by the inſtitution belonged to all the natural lineage and poſterity of* Abraham, *good or bad, without any ſuch limitation as is put upon Baptiſm, if thou believeſt with all thy heart thou mayſt:* But ſure he could not but ſuſpect, there would be ſome ſincere enquirers after the mind of God relating to Infant-baptiſm, who cannot pin their faith upon his ſleeve, cannot reſt ſatisfied with his bare word; therefore he ſhould have proved this his aſſertion, which he attempts not to do, either by Scripture, Reaſon or Authority: And therefore without any more ado I muſt enter my diſſent, and do on the contrary affirm, that Circumciſion whenever adminiſtred to the Adult, in caſe it was adminiſtred according to the inſtitution, it was to believers as believers, taking that term believers as before opened. Now the clearing up and proving this ſo highly conducing unto the eſtabliſhing the Doctrine and practice of Infant-baptiſm, I ſhall ſomewhat largely inſiſt upon it,

and

and for the proof of it I would offer these two Arguments.

First, If all the Adult or grown persons that ever had Circumcision duly administred unto them were believers, and there was no other ground upon which it could be administred to them, then it was administred to them as believers: But all the Adult or grown persons universally, that had Circumcision duly administred to them were believers, and there was no other ground upon which it could be rightfully administred to them, Therefore, *&c.*

The consequence in the major proposition, I conceive will meet with no opposition: I suppose if it be evident, that all grown persons universally, none excepted, that had Circumcision administred according to the institution were believers, and there was no other ground but only their faith, or personal acceptation and performance of the terms of the Covenant, upon which it could be rightfully applyed to them, then this consequence will evidently follow, they must needs have it administred to them as believers. 'Tis therefore only the minor proposition that needs proof; and in order to a more clear proceeding in the proof of it, we must necessarily distinguish of the Adult or grown persons who had Circumcision administred to them; and thus some of them were *sui juris*, had a full liberty and freedom of choice whether to accept or not accept of the Covenant upon such terms; others were *alterius juris*, under the dominion and dispose of some other person: Thus for all the Adult in *Abrahams* or any other believers family,

who were servants either born in the house, or bought with money: Now what was the case of this latter sort of grown persons, and how far the determination of the question before us as it relates unto them concerns our present purpose shall be considered hereafter. At present, let it be remembred, that what I affirm, it is only of persons who were *sui juris*, who were at their own dispose, and I say in respect of such all and that universally that ever had Circumcision rightfully administred to them, they were Believers in the sence before opened: This will appear by instancing in all those that the Scripture records to have had Circumcision administred to them, when adult or grown to ripeness of years; and shewing that they were believers. And thus the Scripture gives us no account of any circumcised when adult, but *Abraham* and those of his posterity whose Circumcision was omitted in the wilderness, and such who from among the Gentiles became proselytes to the Jewish Church, and all those the Scripture evidently declares to have been believers.

First, For *Abraham* himself, none will deny that he was a believer: And therefore

Secondly, For those of his posterity whose Circumcision was omitted in the wilderness, and who were circumcised at their first entrance into the land of *Canaan*, an account of which we have *Josh.* 5. 3. &c. Now that these were believers, is sufficiently evident, for

First, God himself gives this testimony of them, that they were such as had cleaved to him when others had apostatized from him, *Deut.* 4. 3, 4.

Secondly,

Secondly, They were such as had newly renewed their Covenant with God, they had avouched God to be their God, and he had avouched them to be his people, twenty sixth of *Deut.* 17, 18. Verses, compared with the twenty ninth of *Deuteronomy*, the beginning: These two things sufficiently evidence these to be Believers, and they had done nothing to evidence their insincerity, but had several wayes evidenced it, and therefore

Thirdly, for such who from among the *Gentiles* did become Proselytes to the *Jewish* Church: Now I do not remember that the Scriptures do record any particular instance of any of these to have been circumcised; but that such were to be, and that some such were circumcised is sufficiently clear from Scripture, and that when any such had circumcision rightfully administred to them, that they were believers is evident.

First, from the qualification presupposed to their regular receiving circumcision, they must be such as *would keep the Passover to the Lord*, twelfth of *Exodus* forty eighth Verse. Mark, it was not enough that they did desire to keep the Passover, but they must be such as did professedly propose that end to themselves, *viz. to keep it to the Lord*, and Passover here seems to be put *per Synechdochen partis*, for the whole Worship of God; and so the meaning is this; if any would give up themselves to God, and take him for their God, and worship and serve him according to the Ordinances of Worship then instituted; they must be circumcised: So that the qualifica-

tions requisite to their circumcision do necessarily imply them to be believers.

Secondly, this is evident from God's alike entering into Covenant with them, as he did with the Jewes, *Deut.* 29. 11, 15. Now God's entering into Covenant with them doth necessarily imply them to be Believers, in as much as the Covenant, when entred with grown persons, is mutual, as God avoucheth such to be his people; so they must avouch him to be their God, otherwise the Covenant could not be entred with them.

Thirdly, this is yet further evident by the descriptions the Holy Ghost gives of such Proselytes; thus they are sometimes described by *their putting their trust under the wings of the God of* Israel, *Ruth* 2. 12. Sometimes *by their taking hold of the Covenant, and joyning themselves to the Lord, Isaiah* 56; which, though it be a Propheſie of the conversion of the *Gentiles* in New Testament Times, yet plainly alludes to the Proselytes under the first Testament, and shews us what they did or ought to do in order to their incorporation into the Church of the *Jews*; and as a further confirmation of this, *Jewish* Authors give us a large account what care was taken in the admission of Proselytes to circumcision, lest they should have some by respect in their desiring of it; thus they diligently enquired whether they were not fallen in love with some *Jewish* woman, and the like: So that from what hath been said, it fully appears that all those universally, that had circumcision rightfully administred to them, they were believers:

If

If any ſhall ſay, there might be ſome other ground upon which circumciſion was adminiſtred to them, let that ground be ſhewed; If the Scriptures declare no other ground, then we may conclude there was none; But the Scriptures declare no other ground, Therefore we may conclude there was none; and that there was indeed no other ground upon which circumciſion was adminiſtred to them will more fully appear by our ſecond Argument, which is

Secondly, if none of *Abraham*'s Lineage or Poſterity, beyond thoſe that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns could have circumciſion duly adminiſtred to them upon that ground or account of their relation to him as his natural ſeed, then none could have it rightfully adminiſtred to them upon any other ground than their own perſonal faith, or acceptance and performance of the terms of the Covenant; and conſequently all that had circumciſion rightfully adminiſtred to them it was as believers: But the former is true; Therefore the latter.

For the conſequence in the major Propoſition, that is grounded upon this ſuppoſition (*viz.*) That mens relation to *Abraham* as his Children, though mediately deſcended from him, is the chief and principal ground that can be imagined to be a ſufficient ground upon which circumciſion could be rightfully adminiſtred to any; now if it could not be rightfully adminiſtred upon that ground, much leſs upon any other: But I judge (and therefore ſhall ſurceaſe any further proof of it) this will receive a ready acknowledgment from our oppoſers themſelves, hence

hence *our Author* only instanceth in this as the ground upon which circumcision could be administred to persons whether good or bad.

It is the Minor that requires proof, *our Author* asserts the direct contrary, but how unreasonably we shall now see; That then which we are to prove is this, *viz.* that none of *Abraham*'s Posterity or Lineage beyond those, immediately descending from his own Loyns, could have circumcision administred to them according to Divine Institution upon that ground, *viz.* their relation to him as his Children, and consequently none else could have it rightfully administred to them upon any other ground whatsoever; but whoever had it rightfully administred to them, it was as they were believers; this I shall prove by this Argument; If circumcision could be administred to none of *Abraham*'s Lineage or Posterity, whether Infants or grown persons; but upon the account of their precedent interest in and right to the Covenant and the promises thereof, of which it was the token; and none of *Abraham*'s adult seed mediately proceeding from him had a right to or interest in that Covenant, but such as did personally accept of and perform the conditions thereof, then none of his adult Lineage or Posterity mediately descended from him could have Circumcision rightfully administred to them upon the ground or account of that their relation to him as his natural Children mediatly descended from him; But the former is true; Therefore the latter: Here again the Consequence in the Major Proposition will have no gainsay, but the Minor needs proof. Now

that

that consists of two Propositions.

First, that none ought according to the Institution to have Circumcision administred to them, but such as had a precedent interest in, and right to the Covenant and the promises of it; this is too evident to admit of any rational contradiction; for

First, it is evident from the notion under which circumcision was commanded; it was commanded under that notion, *viz.* as the token of the Covenant: Now how unreasonable would it be to imagine that God should appoint circumcision to be applied to any under that notion as the token of his Covenant, who had no right to or interest in the Covenant; how could it be the token of the Covenant to any uninterested in the Covenant; but of this more elsewhere.

Infant-Baptism, Page 22. to 28.

Secondly, this is evident, because the application and reception of Circumcision was a keeping the Covenant; now how the Covenant can be said to be kept by the application and reception of Circumcision, unless the subjects to whom it was applied were in Covenant is impossible to be imagined; can a person keep the Covenant that is not in Covenant? What is keeping the Covenant, but a performing the conditions of the Covenant on man's part? And can any man perform the conditions of the Covenant, and yet have no right to, or interest in the Covenant, or the promises of it?

Thirdly, this is further evident, because interest in the Covenant is the ground of the command concerning the application and reception of circumcision. Fourthly,

Fourthly, this is yet further evident, becauſe otherwiſe God could not truly ſay of Circumciſion, when duly applied, it is the token of the Covenant between him, and the party to whom it is applied; of both theſe things I have ſpoken largely in the place forecited.

Fifthly, it is evident from hence, *viz.* becauſe otherwiſe it had been the univerſal duty of all *Abraham*'s natural ſeed, whether thoſe deſcended from *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*, or from *Iſaac*, to have continued the practice of circumciſion, notwithſtanding their utter apoſtaſie from and rejection of God, and his utter rejection of them from being his people: But who can imagine that circumciſion was or could have been duly applyed to the *Edomites* or *Iſhmalites* when acting in waves of greateſt oppoſition to, and rebellion againſt God? and what abſurdities would follow upon ſuch an aſſertion might eaſily be declared: It is alſo inconſiſtent with what *our Author* himſelf hath elſewhere affirmed of circumciſion: But why ſhould I enlarge upon the confirmation of that, the truth of which ſhines forth with a noon-light clearneſs. And from what hath been ſaid, it undeniably follows, that none were circumciſed by vertue of any command from God, but ſuch as were received into Covenant; contrary to what *our Author* affirms in his reſolution of the firſt queſtion; but let that ſuffice for the confirmation of the firſt Propoſition.

2. *Propoſ.* The ſecond Propoſition, is that none of *Abraham*'s adult ſeed, none of his natural ſeed grown up to years of maturity, had an intereſt

intereſt in or right to the Covenant or promiſes thereof, but ſuch as did perſonally accept of and perform the terms or conditions of the Covenant, or according to *our Author*'s Phraſe, were believers.

This I have proved by three Arguments elſewhere, let me add theſe two or three more. Infant-Baptiſm, Page 67. to 80.

Arg. 1. Firſt, if any of *Abraham*'s Lineage or Poſterity, beyond thoſe that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns, had a right to or intereſt in the Covenant meerly as of his Lineage and Poſterity, then all his Lineage and Poſterity had a like right to and intereſt in the Covenant; But all his Lineage and Poſterity had not an intereſt in, or right to the Covenant: Therefore none had meerly as of his Lineage and Poſterity: The truth of the conſequence in the major propoſition ſtands firm upon that univerſally received Maxim, *A quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia*; look what may be predicated of, or may be laid claim to by any one man, *quatenus homo*, meerly as a man, that may be predicated of, and laid claim to by all men univerſally; ſo in this caſe, but now it is infallibly certain that all the Lineage and Poſterity of *Abraham* had not an intereſt in the Covenant, therefore none of them had meerly as his Lineage and Poſterity.

Arg. 2. Secondly, if *Abraham*'s natural Lineage and Poſterity, beyond thoſe immediately proceeding from his own Lovns, had had an intereſt in and right to the Covenant meerly as his Lineage and Poſterity, then Covenant breaking on their part had been impoſſible; But Covenant breaking

breaking on their part was not impossible, Therefore, &c.

The consequence in the major proposition is evident by this, *viz.* Because then their relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had been the only and alone condition of the Covenant on their parts, nothing more had been simply and absolutely necessary to their interest in and right to the Covenant; but only that their relation to *Abraham*: As in the case of his Children immediately proceeding from his own Loyns, they had an interest in the Covenant meerly as his natural seed, and hence nothing more was necessary to that their interest, but only their descent from and relation to him as his Seed or Children: So in case the Covenant had extended to all his natural Lineage and Posterity, as it did to those immediately proceeding from his own Loyns, their case had been one and the same: Now there can be no breach of the Covenant on man's part, but through his failing and coming short in the conditions of the Covenant: Hence suppose the *Jews* meer relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had been the alone condition of their interest in the Covenant, it would have been impossible for them to break the Covenant; in as much as their sin, whether of omission or commission could not dissolve that their relation to *Abraham*: No moral evil can dissolve a natural relation; hence while their relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had continued, their Covenant interest would have continued. But now (which is our minor Proposition) that Covenant breaking

ing was not impoſſible unto them, the rejection of *Iſhmael* and his Poſterity, of *Eſau* and his Poſterity, of the ten Tribes firſt, and after of the *Jews*, is abundant evidence: How ſuch as are received into the Covenant of Grace in their infancy, may be ſaid to break Covenant; and how that their breach of Covenant is conſiſtent with the unchangeableneſs of the Covenant of Grace, and with the Doctrine of the Saints perſeverance I have ſhewed elſewhere.

Arg. 3. If *Abraham*'s natural Lineage and Poſterity, beyond thoſe proceeding from his own Loyns, had not an intereſt in, and right to the Covenant, meerly as ſuch, then none of them could have been juſtly and righteouſly, finally cut off, excluded from, or caſt out of, either the Covenant or Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, either by the immediate hand of God, or by any Eccleſiaſtical cenſure; But ſome of the Lineage or Poſterity of *Abraham* might be juſtly and righteouſly cut off, excluded from, and caſt out of, both the Covenant and Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, and that either by the immediate hand of God, or by an Eccleſiaſtical cenſure; Therefore, *&c.*

The conſequence in the major Propoſition is firm upon this ground, *viz.* that nothing could be a juſt cauſe for ſuch a cutting off, or excluding from, and caſting out of either the Covenant or Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, but what did nullifie their intereſt in the Covenant: To deprive a man of what he hath a juſt intereſt in, and title to is unjuſt; now if the intereſt of the *Jews* in the Covenant. did meerly depend upon their relation to *Abraham*, as his Lineage or Poſterity, it is impoſſible

impossible their interest could cease while that their relation did continue, and consequently for them, or any of them to have been finally cut off from, or cast out of either the Covenant or commonwealth of *Israel*, either by the immediate hand of God, or by any Ecclesiastical censure, had been unjust or unrighteous: But now that some of them or any of them, in some cases might be justly and righteously finally cut off, excluded from, and cast out of either the Covenant, or Commonwealth of *Israel*, and that either by the immediate hand of God, or by some Ecclesiastical censure, is evident both from Scriptures and Jewish Authors. To what end were threatnings given out, unless their execution had been just and righteous? now how often does God threaten that whosoever should be guilty of such or such sins, *they should be cut off from their people?* and some of these cuttings off did extend to a final exclusion from the Covenant, and all the benefits of it: So that not to enlarge (though other arguments might be added) from what hath been said, it evidently appears that none of *Abrahams* lineage or posterity beyond those immediately proceeding from his own loyns, had an interest in the Covenant merely as such, and if none, then not the Adult, and consequently unto their interest there was indispensibly required their own personal faith. Thus we see both branches of our second argument fully proved: And hence the conclusion undenyably follows (*viz.*) that none of *Abrahams* adult seed, beyond those that did immediately proceed from his own loyns, that were *sui juris*, (for of such we are yet speaking) had Circumcision

Circumciſion duly adminiſtred to them by vertue of their relation to him as his natural ſeed; and conſequently whoever of them had Circumciſion rightfully adminiſtred to them, it was as they were believers. But

Secondly, I ſhall a little touch upon the queſtion, as it may concern ſuch who were *alterius juris*, who were at the diſpoſe, as being under the dominion, of others; of this ſort were all thoſe who *were born in the houſes of*, *or bought with money by* Abraham, *or any of the Covenant people of God* in after ages, who had Circumciſion adminiſtred to them when adult: The command was, *that he that was bought with money or born in the houſe ſhould be circumciſed*, as well as their natural children, and ſome of theſe might be, (as it is evident ſome of them in *Abrahams* family were) adult or grown perſons: Now the queſtion is, whether it was neceſſary in order to theſe, having Circumciſion adminiſtred to them, that they ſhould be believers, or whether ſuch might not, yea ought not to have Circumciſion adminiſtred, as merely appertayning to the family of the people of God whether they were good or bad?

Now for this I ſhall but briefly touch upon it, becauſe it concerns not the practice in controverſie between us, I ſhall therefore only offer to conſideration theſe few things, and come to the ſecond queſtion.

Firſt, That ſuch as we now ſpeak of had the promiſes of the Covenant, and conſequently the Covenant it ſelf extended to them, as well as they had or were to have Circumciſion adminiſtred to them, this is evident both *a priori*, and

Firſt, *A priori*, and thus it was promiſed to *Abraham, that all the families of the earth ſhould be bleſſed in him*, *Gen.* 12. 3. that is in him and in his ſeed, for ſo the promiſe is expreſt when renewed to *Jacob*, *Gen.* 28. 14. and by ſeed, though we are to underſtand Chriſt as chiefly and principally, yet is the myſtical ſeed of *Abraham*, as ſubordinately and leſs principally, intended: So that both *Abraham* and his myſtical ſeed are according to this promiſe made and conſtituted a bleſſing to their reſpective families, or their reſpective families are bleſſed in them; and let it be obſerved, it is not only their natural children but their families that are intereſted in this bleſſing: Now this bleſſing was, intereſt in the Covenant, and hence it is that God promiſes, *to be the God of all the families of Iſrael*, *Jer.* 31. 1. and hence *ſalvation* is ſaid *to come to the houſes of Believers*; *ſalvation is this day come to this houſe*, ſays Chriſt of *Zacheus* his houſe: So the promiſe of ſalvation is made to the houſe of believers, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus and thou ſhalt be ſaved and thy houſe*, *ſays Paul* to the Jaylor, *Acts.* 16. All which Scriptures do ſhew, that *Abrahams* ſeed are bleſſings to their reſpective houſes, and that they are ſo as they do convey an intereſt in the Covenant and promiſes thereof unto them.

Secondly, This is evident *a poſteriori*, from the reference that Circumciſion had to the Covenant, it was to be applyed to none but to ſuch as were in Covenant, as has been before proved: So that I ſay, thoſe to whom Circumciſion was or was to be adminiſtred, they had a precedent right to and intereſt in the Covenant, they were

under

under a promiſe *of Gods being a God to them.*

Secondly, I would offer this to conſideration, that as *Abraham*, ſo all other Maſters or Governours of families, they had a right to diſpoſe of, and anſwerably they ought to dedicate thoſe, we now ſpeak of, up to God, and thereupon teach them his ways and command them as to take God for their God, ſo to walk in his ways. And hence it is to be obſerved, that none were to be circumciſed but ſuch as they had a right and power to diſpoſe of in a ſubordination unto God, they were to be ſuch as were properly *their own*, and hence it muſt needs be their duty to dedicate and give them up to God, and inſtruct them in his ways; and this God does, as I may ſo ſpeak, promiſe to himſelf concerning *Abraham*, *Gen.* 18. 9. *For I know Abraham that he will command his children and his houſhold, and they ſhall keep the way of the Lord:* He will not only command his children but his houſhold.

Thirdly, That as when the people of God are faithful in the diſcharge of their duty, God does uſually concur with them therein with his bleſſing; ſo this command concerning the Circumciſion of the perſons we now ſpeak of, ſeems to be grounded upon a ſuppoſal of both, (*viz.*) that the people of God were and would be faithful in the diſcharge of their duty towards thoſe born in their houſe or bought with their money, and that they had a bleſſing attending them therein. And hence we may

Fourthly, conclude, that all thoſe born in the houſe or bought with money, who were adult, did make ſuch a viſible profeſſion of their owning

God as their God, and accepting of the Covenant as entred with them, as did give a rational ground to hope they were ſincere therein. It cannot rationally be ſuppoſed that ſuch ſhould be received into the Church by Circumciſion of whom they had juſt ground to conclude they ſhould be immediately caſt out again, as in caſe of their manifeſting their non acceptation of the terms of the Covenant by any overt act, they ought to be. Surely if *Iſhmael* one of *Abrahams* natural ſeed, was caſt out upon the firſt diſcovery of his rejection of the Covenant, it cannot be rationally imagined, that any grown perſons ſhould be received into it, but upon a viſible manifeſtation of their acceptation of it: So that the true reſolution of this queſtion, as it reſpects the perſons we now ſpeak of, is this, that though the Covenant extended to them, and they had a viſible title to it as of, or belonging to ſuch a Family, yet in order to the regular adminiſtration of Circumciſion to them, it was neceſſary that they did viſibly manifeſt their perſonal acceptation of it, and reſolution to keep it: But this not concerning our main queſtion, I ſhall add no more to it, but proceed to the ſecond queſtion, and that is,

Queſt. 2. *Whether Circumciſion was adminiſtred to the ſeed of Believers as ſuch?* That is merely as the ſeed of ſuch believing parents: *Our Author* ſtill holds the negative, that they had not; we the affirmative that they had.

All the reaſon he gives for his perſwaſion is this, *that no ſuch qualification was required to an Infants Circumciſion, that he ſhould have a believing*

ing parent: The vanity and ungroundedneſs of which ſufficiently appears from what hath been already ſaid, for if ſo be the due adminiſtration of Circumciſion to the Adult aforeuncircumciſed, did neceſſarily preſuppoſe their faith as we have already ſeen it did, then paſt all rational doubt, unto the due adminiſtration of Circumciſion to their Infants, it was neceſſary that they themſelves ſhould be believers: If faith was required to their own Circumciſion, it muſt needs be alike required to their ſeeds Circumciſion who derived their right thereunto from them: This might be further enlarged upon, but ſuppoſing the truth of what hath been already diſcourſed, the truth of what we here affirm will evidently appear to all rational and intelligent perſons; for if ſo be, none could have Circumciſion adminiſtred to them, but ſuch as had an intereſt in and right to the Covenant, of which it was the ſign or token: Then it undenyably follows, that Infants in order to the due adminiſtration of Circumciſion to them, muſt needs have an intereſt in, and title to the Covenant: And how could Infants come to that intereſt? it could not be by any perſonal act of their own, it was not as related to *Abraham*, as of his lineage and poſterity; for we have ſeen already, that none of his lineage or poſterity had actual and perſonal intereſt in the Covenant, beyond ſuch as did immediately proceed from his own loyns, by vertue of their relation to him: Hence, their intereſt muſt needs ariſe from Gods extending his Covenant as entred with their parents unto them; and the truth is that the promiſe to the ſeed, giving them

their interest in, and tjtle to the Covenant is a branch of the Covenant as made with the parents: Now unto the parents entring & reception into the Covenant, their personal faith was required: From all, it will undeniably follow, that all Infants that had Circumcision duely administred to them, it was as they were the seed of believing parents.

And from all it will yet further follow, as I have elsewhere noted and desire may be carefully observed, that all *Abrahams* natural seed and posterity beyond those proceeding from his own loyns, and that in their Infant state; had the Covenant with the sign and token of it continued to them, and held their interest therein, till rejected of God (First at the transportation of the ten tribes by *Salmanazar*, and after at the coming in of the gospel-administration) not merely as his natural but as his spiritual or mystical seed: Children as grown up to years of maturity were to accept and take hold of the Covenant into which they had admission in their infancy, as the seed of believing parents by personal faith and obedience: Whereupon the consideration of their natural relation, either to *Abraham*, or their believing parents was laid aside, and they ceased to stand under the Covenant, by vertue of that their natural descent, either from *Abraham* or any of his seed, and now were continued under it, as being believers themselves, and as such did convey a right to the Covenant and token of it to their natural seed: So that the Church of the Jews was a spiritual and mystical not a carnal Church, as *our Author* without any true ground from scripture or reason calls it, it was constitu-

ted

ted and made up of *Abrahams* myſtical ſeed, including their natural children immediately proceeding from their own loyns, and that only during their infant ſtate: For being grown to years of maturity they ought, ſuppoſing their rejection of the Covenant, to have been by Church diſcipline ejected and caſt out of the Church. I know what it is that makes what we now affirm ſo difficultly received by our oppoſers (*viz.*) the variety of evils, as Idolatry and the like ſo frequently charged upon that Church and people; but to the mind of wiſdom, as *our Author* ſpeaks, ſeriouſly weighing the large meaſure of the ſpirit then given forth, together with the terms of Covenant intereſt then propoſed, and adding to both the conſideration of ſeveral of the New Teſtament Churches, immediately after their plantation by the Apoſtles, the difficulty will ſoon be removed: But not to enlarge upon this, let that ſuffice for the ſecond queſtion propoſed for examination, unto this fifth particular.

Queſt. 3. Thirdly, whether Baptiſm do correſpond to Circumciſion as thus adminiſtred to Believers as Believers, and to their ſeed after them and that as ſuch.

Anſw. To which it is readily anſwered, that it does, and ſuppoſing the truth of what hath been ſaid, will be eaſily granted by our oppoſers themſelves: That Baptiſm is to be adminiſtred to believers as believers, when the adult, as being unbaptized before, become the ſubjects of it, is granted on all hands; and that it is to be adminiſtred to their ſeed after them, and that as ſuch, is affirmed, and we hope ſufficiently proved by us.

And ſuppoſing what hath been ſaid in the reſolution of the foregoing queſtion be true, will not (I cannot but think) be gainſayd by any. Whence to add any thing more to this would be but a needleſs expence of time, only I ſhall add one Argument to prove, both the Covenant-intereſt and Baptiſm of the Infants of believers, and ſo proceed to the ſixth queſtion, and it is this.

Arg. If the Goſpel Church be ſo incorporated into, and a continuation of the myſtical or ſpiritual body of Chriſt and houſhold of God, of which the Jews under the Old Teſtament were, as to make up with them but one body or houſhold; and the natural ſeed of the Jews by vertue of their Covenant-intereſt were of, and by the then token of the Covenant were incorporated into that body or houſhold; then the natural ſeed of believers by vertue of the ſame Covenant intereſt are of, and by the preſent token of the Covenant ought ſtill to be incorporated into the ſame body of Chriſt or houſhold of God, But the former is true, Therefore the latter. But to proceed

6. That which is further enquired into is, whether Baptiſm do ſucceed in the room, place, uſes, and ends of Circumciſion?

Here *our Author* denyes two things, and gives us ſeveral reaſons, ſuch as they are, of both his denyals. Firſt, he vehemently denyes *that Baptiſm does ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion.*

What he means by room and place, is ſomewhat queſtionable, that which only concerns us to enquire after is, Whether Baptiſm be the preſent ſign or token of the Covenant, as Circumciſion was of old? Now that it is, and anſwera-

bly

bly does ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion, in that general notion and conſideration of it, I have elſewhere abundantly proved, and ſhewed the vanity and inſignificancy of what is objected concerning the ſpirits being the ſeal of the New Covenant, and therefore need add no more: I ſhall therefore only briefly weigh *our Authors* reaſons and haſten.

Infant-baptiſm from page 223 to 241.

Firſt, His firſt reaſon is, becauſe in caſe Baptiſm did ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion, *then only males and not females would be baptized, becauſe of old only males were circumciſed.* To which I would reply, by asking *our Author* who told him ſo, how came he to know it would be thus or thus in caſe Baptiſm did ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion? Might not God if it pleaſed him ordain a token of his Covenant, under the firſt Teſtament, that Males only were capable of, and upon the account of the incapability of Females not impoſe it upon them, and then lay that aſide and ordain another token of the Covenant, to ſucceed in the room and place of the former, in that general notion of it, *(viz.)* as the token of it, of which Females were as capable as males, and thereupon require the application of it to them, as well as to Males? I ſay, why may it not be thus, if God ſo pleaſed? As we ſuppoſe it is ſufficiently evident it hath ſo pleaſed him; who ſhall dictate unto God or *enjoyn him* as Elihu ſpeaks, *the way he ſhall proceed in towards his Church?* Men may as well ſay were God ſo good and juſt as he ſtiles himſelf to be in his word, he would have made man otherwiſe

wiſe, than he hath done; as ſay, in caſe this or that be true, then he would have ordered his Diſpenſations otherwiſe than he hath done; but what acceptation ſuch bold queſtions, *why haſt thou made me thus?* Will find with God, the Scripture foreſhews us; but

Secondly, in caſe Baptiſm do ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion, then *our Author* thinks not all but only ſome adult believers ſhould have been baptized, and the ground of this his conceit is becauſe, as he takes it for granted, *not all but only ſome believers were circumciſed.*

Anſw. This reaſon is much of the ſame nature with the former, only here is one miſtake ſuggeſted, which was not in the former, and that is, that ſome, conſequent to the Inſtitution of Circumciſion, who were to be accounted *Abraham*'s ſeed, were not (he muſt mean as not being under any command from God) circumciſed; this *our Author* dictates but attempts not at all to prove; and therefore I ſhall let it paſs as a fond conceit, without the leaſt ſhew of ground in Scripture, and only ſay, ſuppoſe this were true; yet how it ſhould prove that Baptiſm does not ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſion, as the ſign and token of the Covenant appears not, and therefore what was ſaid to the former reaſon, may be ſaid to this: But I ſay this reaſon being grounded upon a groſs miſtake it vaniſheth, and comes to nothing; could *our Author* inſtance in any one perſon that was to be accounted one of *Abraham*'s ſeed, and ſhew how, or where he had been exempted from the obligation of that Command, enjoying *A-*

braham

braham and his Seed in their Generations to keep the Covenant, he would ſay ſomewhat, though not much to his purpoſe.

Thirdly, his third reaſon is, becauſe *then the circumciſed needed not to have been baptized:* Surely the Reader will judge me a man of no great employment, to throw away time upon ſuch trifles; Is *our Author* alone ignorant, that upon the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, Circumciſion ceaſed to be the Token of the Covenant? or does he think it meet that any, that through their faith in Chriſt are contained in the Covenant, ſhould be exempted from bearing, or had no need of the token of the Covenant? But of this elſewhere: We ſee now of what conſideration *our Authors* reaſons are, whereby he endeavours to confirm his firſt denyal; and therefore

Secondly, let us ſee how he hath proved his ſecond denyal, *viz. That Baptiſm does not ſucceed Circumciſion in regard of the uſe and ends of it:* How far it is neceſſary that there ſhould be a correſpondency between Baptiſm and Circumciſion, in order to the proving the practice of Infant-Baptiſm, hath been already declared; and from what hath been ſaid, it will appear, that ſhould all *our Authors* grounds, as he calls them, upon which he bottoms his denyal be good, yet Baptiſm may ſucceed Circumciſion as the ſign and token of the Covenant, and as ſuch ſerve to ſome uſes and ends of Circumciſion; But let us ſee his Grounds;

Firſt, ſayes he, *Circumciſion was a ſign of Chriſt to come in the fleſh, but Baptiſm a ſign that he was already*

already come, witneſſing to his Incarnation, Burial, and Reſurrection.

Anſw. I ſhall here again ask *our Author* this one queſtion; whether he thinks it was poſſible, for God to inſtitute any ſign or token of his Covenant, when once Circumciſion was laid aſide? I ſuppoſe he will hardly deny this poſſible to infinite wiſdom and power, if he ſay, it was ſimply and abſolutely poſſible in it ſelf, I would know, whether this Ordinance, whatever it ſhould be, muſt needs be a ſign of Chriſt to come in the fleſh? if it muſt, then Chriſt muſt be alwayes to come in the fleſh; ſuch kind of doughty grounds Anabaptiſts build their perſwaſion upon, but it may be his other grounds are more ſubſtantial; Therefore,

Secondly, ſayes he, *Circumciſion was to be a partition wall between* Jews *and* Gentiles, *but Baptiſm teſtified the contrary*, viz. *that all are now one in Chriſt.*

Anſw. I muſt again ask *our Author* whether he think there is no difference between a wall and a door in the wall, and whether both muſt be of one and the ſame uſe? I alwayes judged that a wall was to keep out, a door to let in, and Circumciſion was as *our Author* himſelf acknowledgeth, a ſolemn Ordinance for the admiſſion of perſons, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, into the Church; he expreſly calls it a door, *Page* 27. and ſo is Baptiſm; the truth is, Circumciſion was not the wall, nor any part of it, ſo that here they agree, being both of one and the ſame uſe; but

Thirdly, ſayes he, *Circumciſion initiated the carnal Seed into the carnal Church, and gave a right*

right unto carnal Ordinances; but it is quite otherwiſe with Baptiſm.

Anſw. I muſt yet once more deſire *our Author* to reſolve me one queſtion further, and here I would be ſerious with him, and that is, whether he thinks Chriſt had any viſible Church or Myſtical Body, of which himſelf was Head, under the firſt Teſtament? if not, how is the Church of the *Jews* called his Spouſe, his Wife? If yea, who were the perſons this Church or Body of Chriſt was conſtituted and made up of? But I hope I have ſufficiently proved, that the *Jewiſh* Church was a myſtical ſpiritual Church, or the myſtical ſpiritual Body of Chriſt, and ſo Circumciſion and Baptiſm ſerve for the ſame uſe and ends, *viz.* to initiate or give a ſolemn entrance and admiſſion into the myſtical Body, Church, or Kingdom of Chriſt, as viſible here upon Earth.

Fourthly, *Our Author* adds another Ground, *viz. Circumciſion*, ſayes he, *was to be a bond and obligation to keep the whole Law of* Moſes, *but Baptiſm witneſſed that* Moſes *his Law was made void, and that Chriſt's Law was only to be kept.*

But of what uſe was it before the Law was given? And if it was of ſome uſe before the Law was in being; why may not Baptiſm be, if not of the ſame uſe (which yet certainly it is) yet of ſuch uſe, both to the adult and Infants, as might be a ſufficient ground for its Inſtitution and Application to both, though the Law be now abrogated: But to ſay that Circumciſion was an obligation to keep the whole Law of *Moſes*, any further than the Covenant of Grace eſta-

bliſhed

bliſhed with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations did oblige them thereunto, is a great miſtake, Circumciſion obliged to keep the Law of Chriſt, and ſo does Baptiſm.

Fifthly, the fifth ground *our Author* layes to what he hath aſſerted, *viz.* that Baptiſm does not ſucceed Circumciſion to the uſe and ends of it, as he ſpeaks, is this, *Circumciſion ſayes he, was adminiſtred to all* Abraham's *natural Seed, without any profeſſion of Faith, Repentance, or Regeneration, whereas Baptiſm, to be adminiſtred to the ſpiritual ſeed of* Abraham, *was only upon profeſſion of Faith, Repentance and Regeneration.*

Anſw. But what does this concern the uſes and ends, either of Circumciſion or Baptiſm? This only concerns the Subjects, the one was, and the other is to be adminiſtred to.

Reply. But it may be it will be ſaid, though it do not directly concern the matter in hand, yet conſequentially it does, for if ſo be, the Subjects of Circumciſion and Baptiſm are ſo vaſtly different, the uſe and ends cannot be one and the ſame.

Anſw. But then we abſolutely deny the grounds from whence this conſequence is drawn; we deny that Circumciſion was adminiſtred to all *Abraham*'s natural Seed; yea, that it was adminiſtred, according to the Inſtitution, to any of his natural Seed, as ſuch, beyond thoſe that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns: And ſo that Baptiſm is to be adminiſtred only upon Profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, *our Author* knows, it is the queſtion between us, and conſequently, the bare aſſerting of it is *petitio principii*,

cipii, a begging the queſtion.

Reply. But it will be ſaid, there are ſeveral inſtances produced, which being compared do irrefragably prove it.

Anſw. Take his inſtances ſeverally, each apart by themſelves, and they are but a begging the queſtion three times over; and how we ſhall compare them together, ſo as to make any thing more of them, I know not, neither does he give us any direction to help us therein; for whereas

Firſt, the firſt of his inſtances, as he calls them, is this, ſayes he, *a carnal Parent, and a fleſhly begetting by the legal birth priviledge gave right to Circumciſion, whereas 'tis a ſpiritual begetting, by a ſpiritual Parent, gives only a true right to Baptiſm.*

Anſw. To let paſs the odneſs and uncouthneſs of his phraſes, the thing that is aſſerted is this, that a natural diſcent from natural parents, be the parents what they would, gave right to Circumciſion; whereas tis only faith & repentance as profeſſed, give right to Baptiſm, which is the thing in queſtion, and is denyed by us: So for his other inſtances, they ſtill amount but to this, that none ought tobe baptized but the Adult, capable of perſonal holineſs and of believing, which is ſtill the queſtion between us & is denyed by us. But not to waſt time about ſuch trifles, could *our Author* have produced any one inſtance of any one who, neglecting to take hold of the Covenant, did yet convey a right to Circumciſion, to his children, he had ſaid ſomewhat more to the purpoſe: But I ſhall willingly refer it to the judgments of all unbyaſſed

byaſſed perſons, whether theſe inſtances do more ſatisfactorily prove, that Circumciſion was to be adminiſtred to all *Abrahams* natural ſeed, than what I have ſaid in handling the laſt foregoing queſtion does prove the contrary.

For *our Authors* ſixth ground, I ſhall only ſay thus much, that as Circumciſion was a ſign and token of the whole Covenant, as then adminiſtred; ſo Baptiſm is the ſign and token of the Covenant as now adminiſtred: That is for his ſixth queſtion, his ſeventh ſhall be conſidered, if the Lord will, hereafter.

Now then theſe queſtions being truly ſtated and reſolved, our Argument drawn from the Covenant for the eſtabliſhment of the practice we plead for not only abides firm, but is conſiderably ſtrengthened: For if ſo be the Covenant believers are ſtill under be the ſame Covenant of Grace that was at firſt entred & eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* as the Father of the faithful, & this Covenant as then entred with him did extend to & take in his natural ſeed immediately proceeding from his own loyns & that as ſuch, and was continued in the ſame extent and latitude to all the people of God under the firſt Teſtament ſtill extended to & taking in their natural ſeed immediately proceeding from their own loyns, & this not as either parents or children ſtood related to *Abraham* as his natural lineage & poſterity, but as the immediate parents were believers themſelves; (all which things we have proved) Then the Covenant muſt needs be continued in the ſame extent and latitude ſtill, (*viz.*) as extending to and taking in children with their believing parents. And this is evident not only from

from the utter silence of the Scriptures as to any alteration or change that God has made in the tenour of the Covenant, but from variety of scripture demonstrations that he has indeed made none, but does continue it in the same extent and latitude as formerly he did. Whence that the Covenant does still belong to the Infant seed of believers is abundantly evident: And in as much as the Covenant does belong to them, the token of the Covenant does also belong and ought to be applyed unto them; which again appears not only from that command *Gen.* 17. 9. which is still in force, and alike requires the application of Baptism the present token of the Covenant as of old it did Circumcision, the then token of the Covenant: But from the Apostle *Peters* laying interest in the promise as a sufficient ground for the application of Baptism, as also from our Lord Christs having appointed Baptism for the solemn admission of all those into his visible body, kingdom, and family who according to his will ought to be admitted thereinto: But these things are largely proved in that forementioned discourse whither I must refer the Reader.

For this see my Infant-Baptism from Heaven from page 63 to 128.

CHAP. VI.

The Author's fourth, fifth, ſixth and ſeventh Particulars to diſprove Infant-Baptiſm conſidered, their weakneſs and vanity ſhewed, with ſome ſpecial Conſiderations to ſatisfie Chriſtians about the validity of their Baptiſm, as adminiſtred by ſprinkling or pouring Water upon the Face: The cloſe of the whole.

FOurthly, a fourth Argument that *our Author* layes down for the diſproof of Infant-Baptiſm is a ſuppoſed *alteration or change made in the Ceremony of Baptiſm*, viz. *from dipping or plunging into ſprinkling, or pouring a little water upon the head or face*; whence he concludes it cannot be *Chriſt's Ordinance of Baptiſm.*

Anſw. Firſt, were it granted that ſuch a change were made, how that ſhould diſprove the practice of Infant-Baptiſm, as abſolutely conſidered, he neither attempts to, nor can ſhew. Nay his reaſoning ſeems to grant, that Baptiſm when adminiſtred unto them by dipping is Chriſt's Ordinance of Baptiſm. For the old rule is, *veritas affirmati axiomatis eſt fundamentum veritatis negati.* Now to ſay that Baptiſm as adminiſtred by dipping is only Chriſt's Ordinance of Baptiſm, plainly implies that when it is ſo adminiſtred (as it is certain in ſome places, and by ſome

ſome it hath been, and ſtill is) then it is his Ordinance of Baptiſm. So that as this Argument ſeems to grant that ſometimes Infant-Baptiſm is Chriſt's Ordinance; ſo the utmoſt it can prove is, that as ſometimes adminiſtred, it is none of his Ordinance; But

Secondly, That there is any ſuch change or alteration is denyed, and notwithſtanding what *our Author* hath ſaid ſtill wants ſolid proof. But for this, ſee the preface of my Infant-baptiſm from Heaven, as alſo Mr. *Wills* his anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, and others, that have largely handled this queſtion, a queſtion wholly diſtinct from that concerning the ſubjects of Baptiſm, yet I ſhall touch upon it by and by. Therefore to go on.

Fifthly, His fifth Argument is drawn from the variety of miſchiefs, abſurdities, and contradictions that he imagines may be juſtly charged upon the practice of Infant-baptiſm. And a practice juſtly chargeable with ſo many miſchiefs, abſurdities, and contradictions as *our Author* conceives this to be, is no ways like to be an ordinance of Chriſt.

Anſ. In the general it may be obſerved, how eaſie a thing it is for men to imagine and cry out miſchiefs, abſurdities, and contradictions, and by certain artifices, as ambiguous terms and phraſes, putting that for the cauſe which is not, *&c.* make them ſeem really ſuch to perſons of weaker capacities; whereas they are either merely imaginary, or elſe not at all to be charged upon the doctrine or practice oppoſed. Whilſt themſelves are guilty of no ſmall abſurdities and contradictions in framing and charging them thereupon.

This is too evident in *our Authors* caſe: Let us briefly view his charge in the ſeveral branches of it.

Firſt, For the miſchiefs that he ſuppoſeth Infant-baptiſm may be charged with; and he reckons up no fewer than ten.

Firſt, *By it Chriſts order in the Commiſſion is altered.*

Anſw. That this is merely imaginary, is evident from what hath been already ſaid, to which I muſt refer the Reader.

Secondly, *By it the ſubjects of Baptiſm are changed.*

Anſw. But that's the queſtion under debate, and to beg the queſtion and then bring in what is begged, and charge that upon the practice controverted as a miſchief to diſprove it ſelf, is neither civil nor rational.

Thirdly, *By it all the holy ends of Baptiſm are fruſtrated.*

Anſw. That Infants are incapable of all the ends of Baptiſm *our Author* himſelf hath not yet affirmed: Now if it be the will of our Lord Chriſt that it ſhould be applyed unto them with reſpect unto thoſe ends they are capable of (as I hope it ſufficiently appears that it is) the application of it unto them cannot be rationally ſuppoſed to be a fruſtration of any; much leſs of all the holy ends of Baptiſm. It cannot be a fruſtration of thoſe ends with reſpect unto which it is not applyed, nor can it be a fruſtration of thoſe ends they are capable of, and with reſpect unto which it is applyed. Were all the holy ends of Circumciſion fruſtrated as it was applyed to *Abrahams*

hams ſeed, becauſe they were not capable of all thoſe ends for which it was applyed to *Abraham* himſelf?

Fourthly, *By it the right order and manner of the adminiſtration of Baptiſm is altered*, viz. *from dipping into ſprinkling, or pouring a little water upon the Head or Face.*

Anſw. This we have had but juſt now. I ſhall only ſay, will Mr. *Danvers* bring a plain Scripture to prove that Baptiſm was by the Apoſtles adminiſtred by dipping or plunging, I ſhall engage to bring a plain Scripture for the Baptiſm of Infants: But ſuppoſe that ſuch an inverſion or change; yet it is very unreaſonable for him to charge it upon Infant-baptiſm, he knowing full well, that that manner of baptizing was in uſe, though not before Infant-baptiſm was indeed practiſed, yet before he will allow it ſo to be; he knows who ſpeaks of clinical Baptiſm.

Fifthly, *By it many errors and falſe doctrines have been introduced.* And he inſtanceth in five.

Firſt, *That it is to take away Original Sin.*

Secondly, *To work Grace and Regeneration, and to effect Salvation by the work done.*

Thirdly, *That it is an Apoſtolical Tradition.*

Fourthly, *That Children have Faith, and are Diſciples of Chriſt.*

Fifthly, *That all Children of believing parents are in the Covenant of Grace, and federally holy.*

Anſw. As for his third and fifth ſuppoſed errors, they are [taking Apoſtolical tradition in that ſence in which the Fathers and all Orthodox Divines take it] great truths. As for his three others, I ſhall only ſay that Baptiſm is no way

chargeable with them; neither hath *our Author* attempted to prove that it is: To charge all the errors that some have held with reference to any practice, upon the practice it self, is absurd and ridiculous: Will any be so vain as to charge the Lords Supper with all those errors that some have held about or with reference to it?

Sixthly, *By defiling and polluting the Church, and that three ways.*

First, *By bringing false matter thereinto*, viz, *such who are not Saints by calling.*

Answ. 'Tis no defiling the Church to admit those to whom God hath given a place in it.

Secondly, *By laying a foundation to much ignorance and prophaneness.* And

Thirdly, To joyn them together *by confounding the World and the Church.*

Answ. Our Author himself acquits the Practice of Infant-baptism from both these charges a little after, only let it be observed, that all Infants in Mr. *Danvers* his account are of the World. Now our Lord Christ is express, *he prays not for the World:* And how any can be saved having no benefit by the intercession of Christ, if he doth, I must profess my self not to know?

Seventhly, *By it those many humane traditions and inventions of Antichrist, it is attended with, as practised by that party, are introduced and established.*

Answ. Must every Ordinance be charged with introduction of all those humane traditions and inventions tis attended with amongst superstitious men: Alas! what ordinance then would be left to the Church.

Eighthly, Infant-baptism, by the good will of

our

our Author, muſt bear the blame of all thoſe *debates and contentions amongſt men, relating to the practice of it*. Yea, and

Ninthly, *Of all that bitter hatred, wrath, ſtrife, enmity and perſecutions that are found among men againſt thoſe that oppoſe it.*

Anſw. If ſuch trivial reaſonings be ſufficient to diſprove any doctrine or practice; not only the Chriſtian but even all Religion in the general, that at leaſt ingageth men to morality, would ſoon be caſhiered out of the world. *Our Author* knows, ſuch reaſonings make as much againſt what he pleads for, as what he oppoſeth.

Tenthly, The laſt miſchief *our Author* hath ſeen meet to load Infant-baptiſm with is, that *by it the whole Antichriſtian intereſt is confirmed.*

Anſw. This is a heavy charge indeed could it be proved, but let us ſee what he hath ſaid in order thereunto. And here he refers us to his preface, and he thinks he hath made it ſo plain that every one that runs may read it: Strange confidence! but a little to examine what hath been ſaid, and it is this. *If the very act of ſprinkling or pouring water upon the head or face of the child, with the charms attending muſt give Grace, Regenerate, take away ſin, ſave the ſoul, add to the Church, give right to all Ordinances, as Mr.* Pope *hath ordained? Then theſe two things will follow.*

Firſt, That Chriſts converſion, and the powerful preaching of the Goſpel, his means to effect it muſt be ſlighted, ignorance and prophaneneſs the true intereſt of that ſtate neceſſarily brought in.

Secondly, Hereby the nations neceſſarily oblige themſelves by receiving his law to embrace alſo his doctrine.

Anſw. But what if the practice of Infant-baptiſm do not neceſſitate any to aſcribe any of theſe things to the very act however adminiſtred? And what if vaſtly the major part of Orthodox Pedobaptiſts whether Ancient or Modern do diſclaim the aſcribing of any of theſe effects unto the very act of Baptiſm, and on the other hand do receive and walk in the practice of it, in obedience to the law of Chriſt, and that looking upon it as one of his holy inſtitutions appointed for ſuch holy ends and purpoſes as Infants are capable of, what then will follow but this? That Mr. *Danvers* is one of the moſt unworthy and diſingenious men that ever put pen to paper.

Secondly, For the abſurdities he conceits may be juſtly charged upon that practice we plead for. And thus the

Firſt abſurdity is, *That perſons may have regeneration and grace before calling.*

Anſw. I judge our Author will have hard work to acquit himſelf of this abſurdity, unleſs it be by running into a greater, I would only ask him whether he thinks any Infants are ſaved, Or whether they can be ſaved without regeneration? But

Secondly, Suppoſe this ſhould be an abſurdity, which yet it is far from; how Infant-baptiſm ſhould be juſtly charged with it, he neither doth nor can ſhew.

Secondly, *That perſons may be viſible-Church members before converſion.*

Anſw. If he had ſaid members of the viſible Church, he had ſhewed more ingenuity. But be they either members of the viſible Church or viſible

viſible Church members, wherein the abſurdity lies he tells us not. Its certain they ſometimes were members of the viſible Church; muſt then all the wiſe diſpenſations of God be abſurd, becauſe they ſute not every mans fancy?

Thirdly, *That perſons may believe, repent, be baptized and ſaved by the faith of another.*

Anſw. But a little before Infant-baptiſm was charged as laying a foundation to this error, *viz.* that Infants have faith, here it is charged with a quite contrary abſurdity. Surely it cannot be juſtly charged with both that error and this abſurdity. But if any have been ſo weak as to affirm the one or the other, yet it is diſingenious to charge that upon the practice it ſelf.

Fourthly, *That types and ſhadows are profitable, when the antitype and ſubſtance is come, introducing thereby the legal birth-priviledg, the carnal ſeed, the typical holineſs, the national Church, with no body knows what more, to the reviving Judaiſm and outing Chriſtianity.*

Anſw. Fortiter calumniare, et aliquid hærebit, ſeems to be one of Mr. *Danvers*, as well as *Machiavels* maxims. That the birth-priviledge of the ſeed of Believers which is their intereſt in the Covenant or federal holineſs and right to the ſign and token of the Covenant did either appertain to the ceremonial law, or was typical of any thing under the Goſpel is inſinuated, without the leaſt ſhew or ſhadow of proof, either from Scripture, Reaſon, or humane Authority. Therefore let him pleaſe himſelf with his own fancy, only with this *memento*, that *of every idle word*, whether written or ſpoken; *men muſt give an account at the day of Judgment.*

Fifthly

Fifthly, *That the better to exclude Believers Baptiſm, new Church Covenants are invented, to enter the viſible Church by, inſtead thereof.*

Anſw. This can proceed from no other original, but either groſsignorance of his oppoſers principles and practices, or from meer prejudice if not ſomething worſe. Let it be proved that Baptiſm was appointed for the admiſſion of perſons into particular Churches, or produce the Author that hath invented ſuch new Covenants for the end here ſpecified by him.

Laſtly, For the Contradictions *our Author* ſuppoſeth Infant-baptiſm may be juſtly charged with. And thus

Firſt, He conceits that this practice doth contradict what the pleaders for it do aſſert concerning Baptiſm: *They aſſert* (ſaith he) *that Baptiſm is a ſymbol of preſent Regeneration wrought, and yet applyed to ignorant, unconverted babes uncapable of Regeneration.*

Anſw. This is no other contradiction than what might be charged upon Circumciſion according to the acknowledgment of our oppoſers themſelves. They acknowledge that Circumciſion was a ſymbol of heart Circumciſion, (ſee *our Author* page 223. See Mr. *Tomes* his examen page 83.) and (I ſuppoſe) by heart Circumciſion they mean Regeneration; and yet Circumciſion was applyed to Babes as ignorant, and as uncapable of Regeneration as any Infants now are. Will they reconcile the contradiction as it reſpectes Circumciſion? And, I doubt not, they will ſave us a labour of reconciling it as it reſpects Baptiſm. But

Secondly,

Secondly, That this is a meer imaginary contradiction, whether it reſpects Circumciſion or Baptiſm, will appear if we conſider that thoſe that affirm the one or the other to be a ſign or ſymbol of preſent Regeneration, mean, it is ſo with reſpect to the Adult: Now I have already ſhewed that both Circumciſion and Baptiſm might be appointed for different ends and uſes, with reference to different perſons, and yet ſerve to ſome general uſes with reference to all. What contradiction is it to ſay that Circumciſion was and Baptiſm is a ſymbol of preſent Regeneration actually wrought, when applyed to the Adult; and yet apply the one or the other according to divine directions to Infants for thoſe ends with reference to which it is appointed unto them: And what hath been ſaid for the reconciling theſe contradictions may ſuffice for the reconciling his third and fourth imaginary contradictions, and as for his ſecond I ſhall conſider it under the ſixth particular laid down for the diſproof of Infant-baptiſm. And therefore to come to his Fifth which he thus expreſſeth.

5. *That the baptiſmal Covenant enters into the viſible Church, and yet they deny to Church members the priviledges thereof, and ſeparate from them without any warrantable cauſe ſhewed, or orderly proceeding either againſt them, or they that do own them as ſuch.*

Anſw. If *our Author* knows of any that are guilty of theſe contradictions, he may do well to convince them of their errours, but let not their miſtake be irrationally charged upon the practice it ſelf.

Sixthly

Sixthly, *That we ſeparate from Rome as the falſe Church, and yet own their Baptiſm the foundation ſtone thereof: And others that pretend ſeparation from national and pariſh Churches, and diſown the baptizing of all good and bad with the ſinful ceremonies attending it, yet if Papiſt or Proteſtant upon their own terms tender themſelves to their fellowſhip, they are received without renouncing their ſinful Baptiſm, and performing it in that way they judge right.*

Anſw. Had *our Author* any ſolid reaſon to oppoſe our practice by, ſure he would not ſet up ſuch bugbears that himſelf knows can only ſcare children. But for this pretended contradiction it conſiſts of two branches.

Firſt, That we ſeparate from *Rome* as the falſe Church, and yet own their Baptiſm, the foundation ſtone thereof.

Anſw. That Infant-baptiſm is either *Romes* Baptiſm, or the foundation ſtone thereof, is (as may juſtly be ſuſpected) ſuggeſted by *our Author* meerly to caſt an *odium* upon that practice, and that contrary to his own knowledge: That any Pope, or popiſh council was the inventor or inſtitutor of Infant-baptiſm, he hath not made ſo much as in the loweſt degree probable, I ſuppoſe he will not have the confidence to affirm that whatever doctrine or practice hath been confirmed by any Pope or popiſh council is Antichriſtian. If he ſhould he muſt by his own confeſſion caſt out the Baptiſm of Believers, as well as of Infants. Let this then paſs for a meer calumny, without the leaſt ſhew of reaſon for it.

Secondly, For the other branch, that concerns not

not Infant-baptiſm at all as ſuch, in aſmuch as *our Author* knows full well, it is all one as to our receiving or not receiving ſuch as he mentions, whether they were baptized in Infancy or when Adult. And therefore to divert to matters wholly excentrical to the queſtion would be but a meer *diſpendium temporis*: I ſhall only ſay, if any of thoſe mentioned can receive no ſatisfaction about their Baptiſm will they be baptized again? ſuppoſing they will take in their Infant-ſeed with them, they ſhall not be oppoſed by me.

Seventhly, *Our Author* hath not yet done, he hath one thing more that he conceits a contradiction attending Infant-baptiſm, and that is this: *That we that plead for it do own the doctrine of perſeverance, and do diſown falling from Grace, and yet baptize all the Children of believers, becauſe we conclude them to be in the Covenant of Grace, and yet teach them converſion, and in caſe of unbelief reject them as reprobates.*

Anſw. As this proceeds from, if not wilful, yet very great ignorance, ſo it fully acquits us from two of thoſe miſchiefs he hath afore charged the practice of Infant-baptiſm with, for if we teach the ſeed of believers converſion, (as he ſpeaks) and in caſe of unbelief reject them, how can our practice lay a foundation of ignorance and prophaneneſs, or how can we be ſaid to confound the Church and the world? Can teaching Converſion be a foundation for ignorance and prophaneneſs? Or can the rejecting of unbelievers confound the Church and the World?

But to have done, let all men judge whether the practice we have pleaded for can be juſtly charged

charged with ſuch miſchiefs, abſurdities, and contradictions as *our Author* hath been pleaſed to load it with? Or whether himſelf be not much more to be charged with abſurdities and contradictions, and at laſt this miſchief, that he hath unjuſtly reproached the good ways of God?

Sixthly, *Our Author* endeavours to diſprove the practice of Infant-baptiſm by the ſuppoſed *nullity and utter inſignificancy of it.* It is ſaith he, *no ways ſafe for any to reſt contented with that Baptiſm they received in their infancy, becauſe ſuch their Baptiſm is a meer nullity and inſignificant nothing in reſpect of the New Teſtament ordinance of Baptiſm.* And this he endeavours to make out by this reaſon in the general, *viz. becauſe*, ſaith he, *there is that wanting in it which is ſo eſſential to true Baptiſm:* And he inſtanceth in a two fold ſuppoſed defect in Infant-baptiſm.

Firſt, *There is, ſaith he, the right ſubject of Baptiſm wanting.*

Secondly, *The true external form is alſo wanting, as it is practiſed with us*

Anſw. That Infants are the true and proper ſubjects of Baptiſm, hath been I hope ſufficiently proved, and therefore I ſhall paſs that, and only briefly enquire, whether to adminiſter Baptiſm by ſprinkling or pouring water upon the face, be ſuch a defective manner of adminiſtration, as that it renders it a meer nullity, and inſignificant nothing: So as that none may ſafely reſt contented in their Baptiſm as ſo adminiſtred to them. Now for this I ſhall only offer theſe few things to conſideration, which I deſire may be duly weighed.

First,

First, That the way or manner of adminiſtring Baptiſm is not clearly and plainly determined in the Scriptures, neither the ſignification of the word, nor any of the inſtances left upon record of perſons baptized will determine it. This is ſo fully demonſtrated by others, in particular Mr. *Wills*, that I ſhall add no more for the evidencing of it. And therefore

Secondly, That as there is but a probability that Baptiſm was at any time adminiſtred by immerſion or dipping, ſo there is a probability (to ſay no more) that ſometimes it was adminiſtred by pouring or caſting water with the hand upon the face of the party baptized. Thus when ſo great nnmbers were baptized together, and perſons were baptized in their houſes at midnight.

Thirdly, Let it be conſidered, that Baptiſm adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth anſwer and perform the uſes and ends of Baptiſm, as well as it doth when adminiſtred by immerſion dipping or plunging. For the making out of this I ſhall not need to inſtance in all the ends and uſes of Baptiſm, I ſhall take only theſe four,

1. The firſt is to repreſent to, and as it were ſet before the eyes of the mind the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace. And hence Baptiſm is uſually call'd a ſignificant ſign.

2. The uſe and end of Baptiſm is to ſeal, and confirm unto the ſoul its own intereſt in and enjoyment of that good according to the true terms and tenour of the Covenant. And hence it is called a ſealing or confirming ſign.

3. The uſe and end of Baptiſm is ſo far to repreſent and hold forth the ways and means through

through which the ſoul comes to have an intereſt in and enjoy that good, as may through the concurring light of the word and aſſiſtance of the ſpirit raiſe the mind up unto due apprehenſions of, and advantage it, in the acting of its faith in and upon them, and enjoy the comfort of the good vouchſafed by and through them: Theſe means are two fold according to a twofold kind of good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace.

The firſt of which is wholly extrinſecal to the ſoul, as the waſhing away the guilt of ſin.

The ſecond is intrinſecal as waſhing away the filth of ſin, and the raiſing of the ſoul from a ſtate of death to a ſtate of liſe. The firſt is Chriſt, as having born the curſe of the law, and thereby ſatisfying the juſtice and law of God in his ſufferings, death, and burial, aud deliverance therefrom in his reſurrection and exaltation.

Secondly, The ſpirit, as given to or poured out upon the ſoul, or ſhed abroad (as the Apoſtle elſewhere ſpeaks) in the heart. But.

Fourthly, The uſe and end of Baptiſm is to repreſent and oblige the ſoul to its duty required unto or upon its reception and enjoyment of the fore-mentioned good: And this duty in the general is to die unto ſin, and live unto God. And Baptiſm is appointed for, and doth perform theſe uſes and ends from a certain analogy and proportion that it bears as to the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace, and the means through which that good is vouchſafed: So to the duty required unto or upon the ſouls reception of the good through thoſe means. Now

Secondly,

Secondly, I ſay that Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth anſwer and may perform all theſe uſes and ends as well, and as effectually as it would do if adminiſtred by plunging of the whole body into water.

For the clearing up of this I ſhall offer theſe two things.

Firſt, That Baptiſm, as adminiſtred the one or the other way, doth not bear a full and adequate Analogy and proportion to all thoſe things unto which in the performance of its ends and uſes it hath reference. As for inſtance take Baptiſm as adminiſtred by immerſion, it bears not a full and adequate Analogy or proportion to all the things it hath reference unto; this is evident, to inſtance in two things amongſt others.

Firſt, It doth not fully and adequately repreſent the means through which the ſoul comes to be waſhed and cleanſed from the guilt of ſin, the chief and principal means is the death of Chriſt or the ſhedding of his blood: Hence we are ſaid to be *reconciled by the death of Chriſt*, *Rom.* 5. *to be waſhed in his blood*, *Revel.* 1. Now Baptiſm as adminiſtred by immerſion, repreſents only his burial and reſurrection. but not his death or pouring out of his blood.

Secondly, It doth not, as ſo adminiſtred, at all repreſent the means whereby the ſoul is waſhed from the filth of ſin, that is the pouring of the ſpirit upon, or ſhedding him abroad into the heart of the party baptized. So that ſuppoſing (as we deny not) that baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth not bear an exact and adequate proportion or analogy to all the

things, in the performance of its uſes and ends, it hath reference to, no more doth it as adminiſtred by immerſion.

Secondly, That Baptiſm, as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, as it doth bear ſuch an analogy and proportion to all the things it hath reference to, as that it may through the concurring light of the word, and aſſiſtance of the ſpirit perform all its uſes and ends as effectually as if adminiſtred by immerſion, ſo it doth bear a more full and exact proportion to ſome of them, than it doth as adminiſtred the other way. This conſiſts of two branches.

Firſt, That Baptiſm, as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth bear ſuch an analogy and proportion to all the things it hath reference unto, as that, as ſo adminiſtred, it may through the concurring light of the word, and aſſiſtance of the ſpirit, ſufficiently perform all its uſes and ends to the party baptized. That I may not enlarge, I ſhall only give two inſtances, about which the greateſt doubt muſt rationally ariſe.

Firſt, Baptiſm, as thus adminiſtred, ſo far repreſents Chriſt as dead, buried, and riſen again, as the means through which the ſoul comes to enjoy all the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace, as may raiſe up the mind unto him, and help the ſoul to act its faith upon him for that good. This will appear by theſe two obſervations.

Firſt, That the death of Chriſt, the main and principal means through which the ſoul comes to enjoy all the good of the Covenant, is in Scripture expreſt *by his pouring out his ſoul unto death.* *Iſai.*

Iſai. 53. 12. So all the ſufferings of Chriſt are expreſt by this phraſe, *I am poured out like water*, *Pſal.* 22 14. So the death and ſufferings of Chriſt are repreſented by pouring out the wine in the Lords Supper. And hence the mind being guided by the light of theſe Scriptures, and aſſiſted by the ſpirit, may raiſe it ſelf up unto due apprehenſions of, and may duely act its faith upon Chriſt, as dead, buried, and riſen again, by the ſight of water poured upon the face, as well as by the ſight of the parties baptized immerſion or plunging into the water.

Secondly, That the burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt are in ſome meaſure figured and repreſented by Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, as well (ſuppoſe it be not ſo clearly) as by Baptiſm adminiſtred by immerſion. Theres the pouring water upon the perſon repreſenting the covering of the dead body with earth, which we know is by caſting and as it were by pouring earth or duſt upon it, and then there is the freeing the body from the water poured upon it, or the party baptized raiſing himſelf up from under the water, ſomewhat repreſenting the raiſing of the dead body from under the earth thrown or caſt upon it in the grave: So that Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth ſo far repreſent the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, as may through the means aforementioned perform its uſes and ends with reference to the party Baptized.

Secondly, The other inſtance I would give, is in Baptiſms repreſenting and engaging the ſoul to its duty, *viz.* to die to ſin, and live to God in

the due exerciſe of Grace, and practice of holineſs. And thus Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, may as effectually repreſent and engage to that duty, as though adminiſtred by immerſion or plunging. This is evident from what hath been already ſaid, for look how far Baptiſm as adminiſtred the one or the other way, doth repreſent to the mind the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, ſo far it doth repreſent and oblige the ſoul to endeavour after a conformity to him, in dying unto ſin, and ariſing up to newneſs of life. Thus from the Analogy and proportion that Baptiſm bears to the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, the Apoſtle infers, an obligation put upon all that are baptized, by that their Baptiſm to die unto ſin, and live unto God. Now Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, as it doth more fully repreſent the death of Chriſt, than as adminiſtred by immerſion, ſo it doth though ſomewhat more obſcurely yet alſo ſo far repreſent his burial and reſurrection, as may effectually repreſent to the mind, and oblige the ſoul to its duty.

Secondly, For the other branch of the ſecond particular, namely that Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, doth bear a more full and exact Analogy and proportion to ſome of the things it hath reference unto than it doth as adminiſtred by immerſion. Let us inſtance in that one great end and uſe of Baptiſm, *viz.* to repreſent to the mind and thereby raiſe it up to due apprehenſions of, and acting its faith upon the great means whereby the ſoul comes to be waſhed from the filth of ſin, and raiſed up from a ſtate of death

death to a ſtate of life. This means is (as I have ſaid) the ſpirit as poured out upon the ſoul. Now the pouring out of the ſpirit is more fully and plainly repreſented by Baptiſm as adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, than as adminiſtred by plunging: This carries its own evidence along with it: From the whole of what hath been ſaid we may evidently ſee, that no certain argument can be drawn from the nature, uſes, and ends of Baptiſm, to evince the way and manner of its adminiſtration to be by immerſion, inaſmuch as being adminiſtred by pouring water upon the face, it doth anſwer and may perform all its uſes and ends as really and effectually, as though adminiſtred by immerſion. But let that ſuffice for the third conſideration.

Fourthly, That which I would further offer to Conſideration, is the practice of, at leaſt vaſtly, the major part of the univerſal Church and people of God not only for the preſent, but for ſeveral hundred years by paſt. Thus the way and manner of the adminiſtration of Baptiſm hath been and is by ſprinkling or pouring water upon the face. And here we may conſider the qualifications of the perſons ſo practiſing of it. They have been men as of the greateſt parts and abilities, able to ſearch into, weigh, and determine aright about the mode or manner of practices, as well as about the practices themſelves, ſo men of the greateſt ſincerity acquaintance, and (as I may ſay) familiarity with God. Now in doubtful caſes the practice of the Church of Chriſt ought to have its due regard: *Aut Dei teſtimonio aliquid eſſe confirmandum aut eorum qui Dei amici fuerunt*, ſaith *Plato in Timæo*.

And

And surely when we have the testimony of so many friends of God, we ought not rashly to change our practice: The Apostle takes it for granted that the custom of the Churches of God will by sincere saints be duly attended to, and therefore either to suppress that unbecoming custom among the *Corinthians*, of womens praying and prophesying unvailed, or to put an end to all those contentions that might arise or be continued about that practice, he tells them *they had no such custom, nor the Churches of God*, 1 *Cor.* 11 16. That of *Austin* cited by *Pareus*, being duly bounded and rightly applyed, hath its weight in it, *In quibus scriptura nihil certè definit, mos populi Dei, atque instituta majorum pro lege habenda sunt.* But

Fifthly, Let the blessing that Baptism, as so administred, hath been attended with to many thousands, as also how acceptable to God and comfortable to themselves they have walked through and finisht their pilgrimages here upon earth, as only baptized that way in use among us: be seriously weighed: Of how many thousands who have only been baptized by sprinkling or pouring water upon their faces, may it be said as the Apostle saith of *Enoch*, *they had this testimony that they pleased God*, and have enjoyed the full benefit and blessing of that practice. Now when God hath evidently attended an ordinance as administred after this or that manner with a blessing and that from one age to another and manifested by variety of ways, his acceptation of such who have continued under it as so administred, we ought not rashly and without good warrant from Scripture to attempt an alteration in such a manner of administration. But

Sixthly,

Sixthly, Let it be yet considered, what hazard the administration of Baptism by immersion or plunging exposeth the administrator as well as the parties to whom it is administred, to fall under the breach of some Moral precepts, in special the sixth and seventh. It is true, were it plainly determin'd in Scripture, that baptism should be administred that way, we might expect preservation from those evils, but when the manner of administration is left absolutely undetermin'd in scripture, and consequently it is purely an indifferent thing, whether administred the one or the other way, how such preservation can be groundedly expected, concerns those, who insist so much upon that way of administration, to consider: I might yet add the incapability of many thousands who are the proper subjects of Baptism, and ought to be baptized, to receive it that way. I mean it of grown persons as well as Infants: Thus all that are converted upon dying beds and the like, now it seems wholly improbable that our Lord Christ should make that manner of administration indispensibly necessary, which would remedilesly deprive many thousands of the ordinance it self. But to come to a close by what hath been said we may see, whether there be so much as a probability that the administring of baptism by pouring water upon the face, which is the way I especially approve of, yea or by sprinkling doth render the ordinance a meer nullityand insignificant thing, and whether believers may not rest contented in their baptism so administred to them. Yet this let me add, let every one be fully perswaded in their own minds, only remembring that the manner of the administration of Baptism concerns not at all the subjects of it.

Lastly,

Laſtly, *Our Author* attemps to diſprove Infant-baptiſm by the eminent witneſs that hath been (as he ſaith) born againſt it from firſt to laſt.

Anſw. What heed is to be given either to Mr. *Danvers* in producing, or to the teſtimonies of his witneſſes produced by him, hath been afore conſidered. I need add no more, only let me ſay, it cannot be judged an unequal or irrational requeſt, if I deſire both him and all others of his perſwaſion, that they will give a like attendance and credit to the Authors cited by himſelf, in what they ſay in favour of Infant baptiſn, as they will give them or any others in what they are conceived to ſpeak againſt it. Now both *Auſtin* and *Chryſoſtom* (whoſe teſtimony *our Author* allows) poſitively aſſure us, that in their days Infant-baptiſm was the univerſal practice of the whole Church, and the one of them, that it had been ſo from the Apoſtles days thitherto. So *Bellarmine* (whoſe teſtimony he ought not to reject ſeeing it is produced by himſelf) ſaith, *that Infant-baptiſm is written in the books of almoſt all the Ancients.* The vanity of what he ſaith of its being an Apoſtolical tradition not written, becauſe it is not written in any Apoſtolical book, appears from what hath been already ſaid, *that it is written in the books of almoſt all the Ancients*, is that *our Author* and others of his perſwaſion are at preſent deſir'd to attend to. And let me add that as it is written in the books of almoſt all the Ancients, ſo *ne γε quidem* not the leaſt word or ſyllable is written in any of the books of any of the Ancients in a direct oppoſition againſt it, either as diſſallowed by the ſcriptures, or introduced into the Church by men Now would but men give attendance to, & receive that three-fold teſtimony with that obſervation added thereunto, I doubt not but they will be convinced that as Infant-baptiſm wants not ſufficient teſtimony from men, ſo it is their chief wiſdom and anſwerably will have their minds ſomewhat the more diſpoſed to attend unto and embrace the teſtimony it hath from God, where he in expreſs words ſaith, *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee and thy ſeed after thee in their generations for an everlaſting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee. Thou ſhalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy ſeed after thee.*

FINIS.